

A.M. 1930
C.D. Fengan
CJ

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF The Author

A.M. 1930

June 1930

f
c.1

p6419

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

FIVE POINTS OF COMPARISON IN A GENERAL EVALUATION OF JEREMIAH
AND JESUS

Submitted by
Grady Darwing Feagan

B.R.E. Boston University, S. R. E., 1928

In partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

1930

p6419

(I)

378.744

BO

A.M. 1930

f

c.1

OUTLINE AND
TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<u>PAGES</u>
1. INTRODUCTION.	<u>1-4</u>
The purpose of this paper	1
The plan of this paper	1-4
11. CHAPTER ONE- EARLY HOME INFLUENCES	<u>5-9</u>
physical location	5-6
family traditions	7-8
early training	8
early beginning	9
111. CHAPTER TWO- PERSONALITY AS A BASIS OF COMP.	<u>10-27</u>
the point of approach	10
personality reflected in attitude toward the prophetic office	10-14
personality reflected in appreciation of nature	14-17
personality reflected in attitude toward self	17-23
visions and ecstasies as evidences of the introvertive type of mind	17-18
self-revelation as an outlet for introvertive experience	18-19
the illustration of "the call"	18-20
solitariness of such personalities	22-23
social longings unsatisfied	23-24
the pain of misunderstood love	24-26
the goad of duty	26
a modicum result	26-27
1V. CHAPTER THREE- A COMP. OF MESSAGE AS TO STATE	<u>28-37</u>
a justification of the method of procedure as to message	28-29
the prophetic idea of the State	29
the necessity of rebuke	29
the prophet of doom	30-32

(II)

OUTLINE AND

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CONTINUED

	PAGES
the promise of future restoration	32-34
"the preservation of the remnant"	33
restoration from exile	33
a new and purged Jerusalem	33
the reign of an ideal king	33-34
the new covenant	34
Jesus and Jeremiad Statesmanship	34-37
 V. CHAPTER FOUR- THE MESSAGE TO THE INDIVIDUAL	38-54
The need of individualization	38
Jeremiah's unique contribution	38
The principle as interpretive	38-39
individual responsibility	38
attitude toward foreign peoples	39
attitude toward external symbols	39
Leaders as foremost individuals	40-43
condition of the social order	40
the Deut. Code and these conditions	40
the reform movement and these conds.	41
the brunt of the responsibility	41-43
The hope of the common man	43-45
challenge to break with the old order	43-44
the example of the Rechabites	44
public call to repentance and change	44-45
Jesus' estimation of the individual	45
Illustration of the Pharisee and the Pub.	46
" " " Sermon on the Mt.	46
" " " parables	46-47
Effects of Jesus' est. of the individual	47-49
denunciation of corrupt leaders	47
a prophet of warning	48
summons to preparation	48
Summation of similarities bet. Jer. & Jes.	49-54
doom and its interpretation	49
individual repentance as remedy	49
faith as motif and assurance	49
kind of message delivered	50-54
timeliness	50
passionate spirit	50
stylistic power	51-54
why often overlooked	51
examples of style from Jer.	51
style as indicative of person	52
arguments for the style of Jesus	52-54
a priori reasoning	52

OUTLINE ANDTABLE OF CONTENTS.CONTINUEDPAGES

Wendt on the style of Jes.	53
Garvie on the style of Jes.	53
Jesus' multum in parvo prin.	53
Illustrations of this principle	54
 VI. CHAPTER FIVE- A COMPARISON OF METHODS	 <u>55-61</u>
The point of approach	55
The general power of story-telling	55
Accomplishment of early Christianity	55-56
The story as it's master medium	56-57
the prodigal son	56
a range of examples	57
Jeremiah's story of Coniah	57
Evidences of his story-telling temper	58
message to Babylon	58
hiding the girdle	58
simplicity of language in both	59
Social approach common to both	59-60
Eiselen's summation	60
Written messages as substitute for oral	60
Discipleship as a common principle	60-61
Constancy of Baruch	60-61
Jesus calls the twelve	61
 VII. CHAPTER SIX- THE TWO MEN FROM THE POINT OF PERSONAL RELIGION	 <u>62-72</u>
Their point of view as to religion	62
The absolute seizure of primitive men	63
Effect of these things upon their attitude	63-64
toward temple veneration	<u>65-72</u>
toward veneration of law	65
Jeremiah's att. viewed as enigmatical	65
The line of evidences as to Jer. & the	
Deuteronomic Legislation	65-70
the law is found, when and how	65
Jeremiah is not consulted	65-66
Law is read three times in a day	66
Nature of reforms and Deut.	66
Documentary evidences in Deut.	66-67
Jeremiah's references to the law	67-68
Jer's. personal att. toward Josiah	68
Temper of Jer's. ministry and Deut.	69-70
The probabilities of the case	70
The New Covenant as the full fruition of law	70
Summary of views of the scholars	71-72
Jesus as the answer to the dream of Jer.	71

(IV)
OUTLINE AND
TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTINUED.

	PAGES
VIII. CHAPTER SEVEN- POSSIBLE INFLUENCES OF JEREMIAH ON JESUS	72-78
Definition of term "influence"	72
Statement of disciples when questioned	72
Jesus' definite quotation from Jeremiah	72
Inward and significant influences	73-76
Inner life of Jesus with its growing oneness with the Father	73
The suggestiveness of the Transfiguration	73-74
The Last Supper and the New Covenant	74-75
Striking similarities of att. and message	76-78
Attitude toward Temple and ritual	76-77
Popular reaction led by leaders	77
The points at issue	77
The result	77-78

FIVE POINTS OF COMPARISON IN A GENERAL EVALUATION OF JEREMIAH AND JESUS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is not to survey the lives of Jeremiah and Jesus nor to enter into any kind of detailed picture of the historical processes lying behind these two tremendous figures, but rather, presupposing all of this background material, in the light of it, to draw for ourselves five outstanding lines of comparison from a general evaluation of the two men.

The many pitfalls which beset a work which presumes precisely to describe the influence of one man upon another are freely granted. It is not the purpose of this paper to render verdict in such matters but, rather, to seek to coral and integrate as far as we are able five concrete elements common to both life situations insofar as they seem to bear vital relationship of similarity or contrast with each other.

The general plan of this paper has been hinted in the title. It is five-fold. First, we shall compare the early home influences of both men, seeking to ascertain for ourselves the vital elements contained in such considerations as that of physical location, family traditions, and early training.

Second, we shall seek to form for ourselves some concrete ideas with reference to the personalities of the two men. We freely realize that this chapter, within itself, might well fill out the content of a whole paper such as this. But, in the interest of spacial limitations and also in the interest of a

proportionate outline which shall be true to its original purpose, we shall confine ourselves to four major considerations.

First, we shall treat of both men in respect to what seems to indicate marks of personal genius. Second, we shall view both in their general dispositions toward the world of nature and see them in their uses of nature's imagery. Third, we shall seek to catch some of their pungent reflections upon themselves. This will involve their qualities of introversion, some self-revelations of personal idealism, and some reflections upon the element of solitariness which must inevitably come to those so conditioned.

Our fourth major consideration in the Chapter on Personality will involve the attitudes expressed with regard to the group. How did they react to people about them? What were their social longings? Were they satisfied? What effect had these things upon the personalities of the prophets?

Our third line of comparison will concern us with the messages of Jeremiah and of Jesus. For convenience, we are considering these briefly under the three general heads of messages on the condition of the state, messages on the condition of the leadership of Israel, and messages directed pointedly to the individual. Under the first subhead, messages on the condition of the state, we shall see as common elements rebuke, declarations of immediate judgment, and prophecies of future restoration.

Under the second subhead, messages on the condition of the leadership of Israel, we shall mark the spirit of denunciation for moral perversity, the spirit of open challenge to corrupt leaders, and a sense of pity for those who look to such leadership.

This section will involve most of what we have to say with reference to the sins of the social order, since both men laid such things largely at the door of the corrupt leaders.

As a third major consideration in the chapter on Message, we shall consider the pungent appeals levelled directly at the individual. Incident to this discussion, it will be necessary for us to consider the ideals of the prophets with reference to personal responsibility. We shall see that these ideals lead them into open calls for personal repentance and wooing presentations of Jehovah's way of forgiveness.

After considering the three main divisions under which the messages seem to fall, we shall, as a fourth consideration in the chapter on Message concern ourselves with some of the outstanding characteristics of the messages. We shall see in all of them a general undergirding of the spirit of divine faith. We shall see in them a rather frequent use of the strategy of circumstance, and we shall not be devoid of our appreciation of their freshness and vigor of style.

Our fourth major line of comparison concerns us with the methods pursued by the prophets. We shall consider these in a two-fold aspect. First, we shall ask ourselves what were their methods for gaining and holding the public attention. Second, we shall seek to determine in what ways they sought to perpetuate their impressions, or, what plans were set in operation to insure that their messages should not readily die or be forgotten. In the first case, we shall examine the story element with its tendency to parables, the brief and crisp use of analogy, strik-

ing word pictures, and the overtly spectacular.

The fifth line of our general approach to the subject will be found in a consideration of the personal religion evinced in both cases. We shall seek, first, to see just what religion meant to them personally and, second, to trace the effect of such a religion on some of their outstanding messages, especially as regards temple worship, the veneration of the sacred city, worship of the law, and ideas of the covenant obligation.

We shall conclude our study of the personal religion of the two by a consideration of its general effects upon their hearers. This consideration will be taken as an outgrowth of their inner experiences, working by compulsion to the establishment of certain vital and storm-centered positions with respect to the deepest popular veneration of the day.

As a last chapter in our cursory evaluation of the two, we shall endeavor to sum up briefly the conclusions borne out by the testimony along the way and add our own word of earnest appreciation for the rich spiritual heritage which has thus been bequeathed to succeeding ages.

CHAPTER ONE - EARLY HOME INFLUENCES.

"A brick wall of an hour northward of Jerusalem along one of the great highways which radiate from the sacred city brings one to the little town of Anata, Anathoth of the Hebrews. It is unattractive today with its few poor hovels, and it must have been insignificant also in antiquity" (1)

Such was the physical setting in which the prophet Jeremiah received his boyhood impressions. Yet it is not necessary to believe that it constituted the whole of the physical setting. The words "an hour northward of Jerusalem" are pregnant with meaning. Jeremiah knew Jerusalem as a boy. The probabilities are that he had spent a great deal of his time there. When he spoke his messages to the sacred city as a prophet, he was by no means on alien soil nor among alien people. He would have been a very queer kind of boy if the great, throbbing city had not almost daily left its impact upon his young sensitive personality.

In two respects, at least, the physical location of Jeremiah's boyhood was similar to that of Jesus. The town of Nazareth, like the town of Anathoth, was little and insignificant. And, again like Anathoth, it was near a great city. Case believes that the proximity of Nazareth to Sapphoris was a major consideration in the early character development of Jesus. (2) Certainly Sapphoris, with its heterogeneous population and its busy, bustling trade, must have appealed strongly to Jesus' interest in human nature as such, and it would not seem that we would be going afield to say that it contributed to his rather democratic

1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible, p 227f

2 Case, Shirley Jackson, "Jesus-A New Biography" p 200 ff.

disposition, which often proved very distasteful to the stricter Judaizers.

Though both cities were small and insignificant of themselves, they were, in a sense, then, redeemed from obscurity by their proximity to large cities where those who wished might have ready access to the advantages of urban life and a view of the more intricate and complex developments of human society. But this was not all that redeemed them. It frequently happened that given families in the smallest of out-of-the-way places cherished the fondest traditions and counted themselves by blood to be full-fledged Israelites of the first order. Such was probably the case with Jeremiah.

"Anathoth was the city to which Abiathar was banished when he was deposed by Solomon from the priesthood of Jerusalem and it is by no means improbable that Jeremiah, who is said to be of the priests that were in Anathoth, was thus of Eli, the custodian of the ark at Shiloh. If so, his family would cherish some of the proudest memories in Israel". (1)

It is not easy to estimate just how much a consideration of this kind would weigh in the development of a prophet. Doubtless, this would depend upon the temper of the prophet and the degree of his careful study of Israel's history. From our general knowledge of Jeremiah, it is not improbable that such fond traditions of birth served to intensify his divine urge to speak in the face of the corrupt and perverted conditions to which his beloved country had fallen. We can realize a little better how it was possible for him to undergo such unspeakable sacrifices for his truth when we consider his inner reflection upon the

1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible, p 228

order from which he had arisen and the valiant names of Israel whose blood was then coursing in his own veins.

Jesus was considered to be a 'son of David'. (1) Just how much this consideration influenced Jesus himself it would be hard to say. Certainly on at least one occasion Jesus publicly rebukes those who trust too much to their sonship with Abraham. (2) But the popular currents of Jewish Messianism in vogue in Jesus' day certainly laid hold of his Davidic descent. Jeremiah himself had spoken of "kings and princes sitting on the throne of David". (17:25) He had heard Jehovah say "I will raise to David a righteous branch". (23:5) He had further prophesied that Jehovah would cause the branch to grow up into David. (33:15) In 33:17 Jeremiah reaches his highest point in this regard when he declares that David would, from that point on, never want a man to sit upon the throne of David.

Without entering into the polemics which have clustered around such passages, in the light of them, it is easy to see how the popular Messianism built its hopes around the figure of David. Jesus himself would have been dull indeed if his Davidic association in its effects upon the people had passed unnoticed. Case, indeed, uses this Davidic association as a form of proof that the theory of the Virgin Birth of Jesus is historically untenable. (3) Such a use of it is only another indication of the scholar's conviction that it played no mean part in the Jesus story.

Both men, then, had names to live. They considered themselves

1 Luke 3:23-38

2 Matt. 3:9, Luke 3:8

3 Case, Shirley Jackson, "Jesus-A New Biography", p 24 f.

to be men of pedigree. They probably considered that the very conditions of their births had presaged them to lives of unique importance in the history of Israel.

When we approach the matter of home training we are again largely on common ground. It is true that after the Exile education became more widespread and elaborated than it had before, the synnagogue schools were scattered everywhere over Israel in the day of Jesus. Yet, in the day of Jeremiah as well as of Jesus the family as an institution played a central part in the education of the Jewish child. His first teachers were his own parents and his almost exclusive text was the Torah, or Laws of Moses. The method of juvenile instruction for both Jeremiah and Jesus was that of oral repetition. Hence, it is no wonder that both men could quote at will from the happenings of former prophets and the trends of previous public affairs. (1)

The estimation which they themselves placed upon all this training is probably echoed in such a question as we find in 13:23 "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" Jesus probably sensed the value of this perennial training when he spoke of the impossibility of a good tree's bearing evil fruits or of an evil tree's bearing good. (2)

"Frederick Denmore Maurice pointed out that it was a singular feature of the life of Jeremiah at the time when the great religious reformation was under way under Josiah that both the king Josiah and the great prophet Jeremiah were young men. The association of these two Hebrew youths as leaders in the work of the restoration of the kingdom of God in Judah is significant. For the heart of a reformer we look to youth. It is then

1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible", p 238
 2 Matt. 12:33 Luke 13:33

that ideals are noblest. They have not been lowered in obedience to the world's demands for compromises and expediencies. There is a healthy impatience of evil. Youth does not mean to acquiesce in wrong as the inevitable. It will hear no counsels of despair. It is intolerant of delays and hesitations". (1)

Both Jeremiah and Jesus began early life to do the work of a prophet. When the great Deuteronomic Code was "found" by Hilkiah, the priest amid the ruins of the Temple, Jeremiah had already been prophecying for about five years in Jerusalem, although then probably in extreme youth for a prophet. Knudson dimly suggests his youth as one of the reasons why he may not have been consulted. (2)

According to the Gospel story, Jesus began his active ministry when he was about thirty years old and closed it only a year, or, at most, three years later. Both men, as Maurice points out of Jeremiah and king Josiah, had the impetuosity, the fearlessness, and the will of youth inspired by the terrible needs of the hour.

- 1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible", p 232
- 2 Knudson, Albert C., "The Beacon Lights of Prophecy", p 175

CHAPTER TWO. PERSONALITY AS A BASIS OF COMPARISON.

The scientific study of personality from the point of view of analysis is relatively modern. Psychology as a whole belongs to the realm of the younger sciences and psycho-analysis as a specialized field represents still one of the pioneering moves in the realm of this young science. Hence, for us to treat Jeremiah and Jesus according to the patterns laid out for us by the psycho-analysist would mean that we too would be either forced into a great deal of pioneer venturing or else into the elaboration of the various angles of approach represented by Freud, Alfred Adler, Jung, and many others. For the purposes of this paper, we believe that a presentation of the personality comparison can best be done by a few reflections upon the attitudes taken by each with reference to the prophetic work, the world of nature, the world of self, and the world of other people.

It can hardly be denied that both men possessed clear marks of genius. If to be normal means to be average, neither of them was normal. Prof. Bundy's comment on the heroic hyperboles of Jesus are in point here. It follows.

"In such passages we are not dealing with formal religious teaching but with a highly concentrated personality that deliberately tears itself from every interest, no matter how natural or how normal, in its quest for God and His Kingdom.----It is true of genius in whatever field it appears that it sets everything at stake for the one thing that means everything to it. The genius is a highly unified personality. He achieves a remarkable singleness of self that is capable of the most compact concentration upon the focus of his faith and of a total exclusion of all other

things that do not bear immediately upon the goal that he has set or that interfere with its attainment". (1)

The above quotation concerning the concentration and unification of personality achieved in Jesus as an unmistakable mark of his personal genius might apply equally well to Jeremiah. In the midst of Jeremiah's tremendous messages of warning, rebuke, and doom we are irresistably driven to the feeling that we are keeping company with one who has "set everything at stake for the one thing which means everything". There is abundant evidence that Jeremiah, like Jesus, was the recipient of visions and voices. Ample materials there are to prove that he moved upon a plane of personal abandon to his task and of emotional tensivity in the discharge of it which would absolutely preclude any possibility of rival considerations. Jeremiah, as in the case of Jesus, did not strive for these ecstatic experiences as any kind of inner proof of his prophetic validity but they, rather, came as bi-products of that extreme unification of self and purpose which reaches its focus of faith in a total exclusion of all other things that do not bear immediately upon the goal.

Bundy speaks of Jesus as one whose messages do not originate in ecstatic experience, calling attention to the fact that Jesus never refers to his call as coming nor to his messages as imparted at some special time or place, in some striking, psychic manner. (2) In other words, Jesus was able to control his ecstatic moments and never allow that they, rather than his calmer reflections upon life and duty to God, should control or veer the quality of his message.

1 Bundy, Walter E., "Our Recovery of Jesus". p 141

2 Bundy, Walter E., "Our Recovery of Jesus" p 293

The same writer, speaking of Jeremiah, declares that he is the first among the prophets to make a conscious effort to suppress the ecstatic element in religious experience, while at the same time admitting that, in the face of this fact, the ecstasy is still so strong at times as to suggest hallucination. (1) Here, then, we have in both Jeremiah and Jesus that marvellous singleness of self and unification of personality which not infrequently borders on ecstasy. And yet, here we have two men who seem to know the difference between ecstatic moods and experiences which come unbidden and linger without license in overheated brains and overcharged wills and, on the other hand, that clear program of work and duty which arises from a deliberate and meditative survey of the world around them in terms of its relationship to their convictions of life's highest spiritual values.

It is very popular today for writers on Jesus and on Jeremiah to write at length on the parts ecstasy, hallucination, trance, etc. may have played in their destinies. Every shade of belief, from the thought that one or both may have been positively insane to the thought that most of these life situations which portray such things must be toned down with the idea of interpolations and glosses made by later hands in the interest of what these later ages would consider doubly corroborative of prophetic position. It is quite unnecessary that we should detain ourselves with the varied arguments adduced. Our position is that, whatever theories are followed, the record of such things accentuates the fact that both of them were positively dead in their concentration upon their immediate purposes and that, to a measure seldom given to

mortals, both actually achieved that high and sensitive personal integration which is so noticeable in real genius.

But this absorption upon task does not mean that they were narrow men. Usually such attainment comes at the direct cost of personal enrichment. The highly specialized individual is very apt to know nothing except his specialty, the popular definition of genius being that state wherein one comes to know "more and more about less and less". The type of genius attained by these two prophets will not easily fit this definition. They were con-centered upon their tasks but the extent of their tasks proved redeeming. Their tasks were not merely to impart God's will to the people, but to so clothe upon the enunciation of that will as that men may feel the heart of the Eternal in that will wooing men to himself. This involved on the part of the prophet all the imagery of love and of pathos that the world around him could afford.

Jeremiah abounds in imagery from the world of nature. He touches many sides of the wonderful out-of-doors, which reveals to us a spirit, sensitive and keen, to the things that were dear. He remembers the vineyard with the fruitful and the unfruitful vine (2:21) and the grape-gatherer (6:9). He speaks of "the green olive tree, fair with goodly fruit (11:16). The fields of ripened wheat do not pass unnoticed (23:28). The glad and glorious harvest season is to him a wail that "the harvest is passed, the summer is ended and we are not saved" (8:20). He has watched the laborings of a calf as he chafes under the restraint of his first yoking and compares him to rebellious Ephraim (31:18).

He has watched the hunter catch his game and declares that "the wicked watch as the fowlers who lie in wait, they set a trap, they catch men" (5:36). In 8:7 the stork, the turtle-dove, the swallow, and the crane all catch the focus of his swiftly observing eye. He travelled the ranges with the shepherds. He watched them pitch their tents (10:20). The sheep at night interested him (33:12,13). The lion to him was wonderful (2:15), while even the ways of the wild asses (2:24), the leopards (13:23), and the jackals (4:17) were well within the province of his prophetic usage.

His own heart knew what it was to experience with his people a long dry season. He feels the suffering of the wild beasts under such conditions. His heart goes out to the poor plowman, and he verily groans in travail with the very ground that can produce no herbage (4:11-13).

In this respect Jesus is no whit behind Jeremiah, his great proto-type. He too lives the life of God's great out-of-doors. He preaches beside the ripples of blue Galilee, by the roadside, on the mount, or in a boat. Never does he feel the actual need of an artificial setting for worship. The world is his chapel and even the dusty highways are holy ground. Like Jeremiah, Jesus handles nature with delicate skillfulness. In Matt. 5:45 God's beneficent plan in the sunshine and the rain adds richness to his sermon. In Luke 10:18 and in Matt. 24:27 he pictures the lightening. In Luke 12:54f we see the rainclouds which rise in the west and feel the south wind with its scorching heat. He speaks of the grain of wheat which, by its sacrificial

death, gains multiple life (John 12:24). He stands entranced at the very mystery of plant growth from tiny seed (Mark 4:28). In Mark 4:3ff ~~he places~~ he places his approval upon the sower's good ground. In Mark 7:16 we are told how the seed conditions the tree and the tree the fruit. In Mark 4:31 and in Luke 13:19 we see the power of God that the mustard seed should attain to so high a destiny. The lilies of the field arrayed beyond the glory of Solomon, yet adorned simply and solely by the loving care of the Heavenly father (Matt. 6:28), the reed that sways with the breeze (Matt. 11:7), and the grapevine in need of pruning (John 15:2) are all ranged along the path of his illustrations. The innocence of the dove (Matt. 10:16), the wisdom of the serpent (same passage), the dens of the foxes and the nests of the birds (Luke 9:58) all come in for appropriate mention. And when, in those last bitter hours, he stood on a hill overlooking his beloved Jerusalem, the Jerusalem of so much hope and so much sorrow, it was in the language of the brooding hen that he voiced his wail and his disappointment (Luke 13:34).

One would naturally expect that we should have immediately passed from our consideration of marks of genius in the two men to our appraisal of their attitudes toward themselves, as both have vitally to do with their inner conceptions of their missions in life. We have purposely taken the discussion of their attitudes toward the world of nature first. It is so easy in studying one's pungent reflections upon self, involving as they do the subjects of introversion, self-revelation, and social solitariness, to imagine that long spans of life were taken up with nothing else than involved reverie. To imagine this in the case of

Jeremiah and of Jesus would be to do violence to the picture. Their eyes were open to see and appreciate the world about them. Their very attitude of loving concern for the orderly processes of nature show them to believe that the material creation is the work of God's goodness and care. To miss it would be to miss a great deal that is vital in the life of God and to miss this would be to miss their full measure of testimony. Yet, for them to have followed life objectively, after the manner of a Benjamin Franklin for instance, would probably have meant rather surface living and a toning down of points of conscience in the interests of outward pleasure and conformity. Observation was never an end in their lives, neither was it taken to be simply a medium of supply for a ready manipulation of speech. It must mingle its telling images with the deep stirring of soul and find its place in the fuller expression of a mighty struggle between transcendent selfhood and the low, mud flats of carnal life and desire.

Both men exhibited the qualities of the introvert in their attitudes toward themselves. Prof. J. M. P. Smith says that not only was Jeremiah certainly susceptible to ecstatic experience in visions but that it is clear in at least one place, (1:9f) that he is giving the content of a vision even tho he does not mention the fact that it was a vision. (1) So intent was this inner reverie, this turning of the mind inward upon one's self, that the world within actually became more real to the being of the prophet than the world of sight and touch. This fact may furnish us with at least a partial explanation of his unshakable confidence in the correctness of his interpretations

1 Smith, J.M.P., "The Prophets and Their Times" p 140.

of history and of current events. In Jer. 15:10, 11, in 17:14-17, and in 18:18-20 we have graphic instances afforded of the fluctuations of temperament and the gusts of passion that so easily beset us all. These passages present some of the strong moods of the prophet.

Prof. Bundy seems to be unwilling to admit that Jesus was an introvert to the degree of Jeremiah. Indeed, he declares that the visionary materials in the gospels confine themselves at most to sporadic details. (1) Prof. Walter E. Horton, in discussing the mind of Jesus, declares that for the scientific psychologist the life of Jesus is a singularly unattractive subject, the data being almost totally inadequate. (2) Yet, we feel ourselves at this point almost compelled to take the attitude of Prof. Case when he says, "Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are all men of violent moods. Since childhood the scriptural portrayal of the prophetic experience had been familiar to Jesus and from the hour of his baptism the prophets' sense of divine impulsion had been his immediate possession. He too knew the heights and depths of emotion----the ecstasy of a transfiguration moment and the dark shadows of Gethsemane----that were the portion of one dominated by a will not his own". (3)

If it is true, as we believe it is, that both men were introverts, then we must expect not only to find evidences of these inner reveries prolonged into visions, but we must also expect to find at rare intervals disclosures or self revelations which shall serve to indicate for us the kind of inner idealism such introversion was stimulating and building. Solitude has

1 Bundy, Walter E., "Our Recovery of Jesus" p 290

2 "The Journal of Philosophy" XXI, 19, p. 528

3 Case, Shirley Jackson, "Jesus-A New Biography", p. 327

Solitude has been called the mother country of the strong. Just what was the strength of their solitude?

The frequent personal interchanges between God and Jeremiah may easily have been confided to Baruch, his faithful servant and scribe. Certainly, the book abounds with material which could have been gained only through the most intimate self-revelation. No finer instance of the working of this inner idealism through solitary, ecstatic reverie can be had for either Jeremiah or Jesus than the situations clustering around their calls.

Prof. Bundy points out that "Jeremiah's call takes on the form of two visions in rapid succession which furnish him with all that he is to do and say. It is very definite and concrete in its instructions. To this divine call Jeremiah at first responds 'Ah, Lord Jehovah, behold, I know not how to speak, for I am but a child'. (1:6) But this lack of self confidence is overcome by the touch of the divine hand and henceforth Jeremiah is the fearless champion of Jehovah". (1) Like the other prophets Jeremiah was conscious of a distinct crisis in his life when his mission was made clear to him. In a vision he saw Jehovah in human form, who told him he had been set apart to his work before birth. (2) The distinct crisis referred to lay in the fact that the times were in no way propitious to the true prophet. In Jeremiah's mind there was an instinctive fear of the opposition which he would have to encounter. "A true prophet would have to lift up his voice against the whole course of society and bring down on his head the malediction of high and low". (3) We can see how intense must have been this

1 Bundy, Walter E., "Our Recovery of Jesus", p 274.

2 Smith, Henry Preserved, "The Religion of Israel", p 164

3 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible", p. 233.

reverie in the face of such imperious summons to duty and at the same time such an enormous awareness of public issue. We are not reasonably to suppose that the battle within the soul of Jeremiah was evanescent. It was probably long and harassing ere the final victory came.

The situation was not vastly different in the case of Jesus. His call too was connected with real states of introversion. He too made intimate revelations of the inner working of this growing idealism. Dr. Geo. A. Barton declares that "the story of the solitary struggle in the wilderness lay for months locked in the breast of Jesus." He believes that "it was not till shortly before his crucifixion, at Caesarea Philippi, that he disclosed to his disciples the fact that he was the expected Messiah. It was then, we believe, that he drew aside a little of the veil of his own inner life and told the disciples of the voice that had spoken to him at his baptism, of the doubts that had assailed him in the wilderness, and of the sure conviction and deep peace with which he emerged from the struggle". (1) We can never truly know just how much of these intimate glimpses of Jesus have come to us through the medium of self-revelation to his own closest disciples in the strategic moments of their confidence with their Master. When John Knox was called to be a preacher by the acclamation of his fellows in the church of St. Andrew, he was so over-whelmed that, after an ineffectual attempt to address the congregation, he burst into tears, rushed out, and shut himself up in his chamber, persuaded that he could never appear in the pulpit again. (2)

1 Barton, Geo. A., "Jesus of Nazareth", p. 125

2 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible". p. 232

Dr. Hastings remarks that there is no such shyreccil found on the part of Jesus. We wonder if the temptation scenes, following so closely afterward are not significant in this respect..

While writers represent a variety of opinions as to just what the baptism of Jesus actually meant to him, there is a common thread of feeling that it was at least a crisis in respect to his call. Says Prof. Bundy, "That the Gospel writers intend this Jordan incident as important in their accounts of Jesus and of great significance for him personally, is clear in the place in which they report it and in the understanding they have of its meaning. All three report the vision in connection with Jesus' first personal appearance in their accounts of his public life. In all three the vision is initial and inaugural and all three regard it as a primary promoting factor that brought him out of private into public life". (1) This being true, then the temptations which followed immediately must have been fraught with deepest significance with respect to the personal reaction in the mind of Jesus. Would it be going too far to say that he too instinctively recoiled in the face of the enormity of the problem before him, his knowledge of the sad state of affairs which he would be forced to challenge, and, as Case points out, what had happened to other prophets who, in the face of such untoward conditions had, in other days, ventured to give their messages? (2)

In taking such a position, we are not bound to believe that Jesus' consciousness of call, his conviction concerning his commission, rested upon single and special moments or series

1 Bundy, Walter E., "Our Recovery of Jesus", p. 284

2 Case, Shirley Jackson, "Jesus-A New Biography", p. 261

of ecstatic states alone. We are inclined to agree with Prof. Bundy that Jesus' consciousness of call rested upon something far deeper and more fundamental than the work of ecstatic states alone. All the way through the Gospel account we see that, for Jesus, the psychological weight was on his choice of God and His cause rather than on God's choice and call of himself. Jesus often expressed his consciousness of call and his conviction of divine commission. "But these expressions come in the form of single, crisp sentences, the thought and point of view of which pushes his own person into the background submerged by the cause which he champions". (1) Yet, our point in this chapter is not to prove that Jesus, or, indeed, Jeremiah rested the consciousness of call upon states of introversion but that these visions and intense inner musings were vitally operative in their lives, their calls being simply a foremost instance.

The fact that they were by disposition introverts meant for them that their lives should present a certain solitariness even apart from the social ostracism which their messages were bound to provoke. On one occasion Jesus dismisses his disciples while he goes alone into the mountain to pray. (2) On another occasion they hunt for him while the crowds have gathered and eagerly await his message. They find him in a solitary place entirely careless of the fact that the multitudes are seeking him. (3) Again, after a day's work, his disciples quietly disperse to their several lodgings while Jesus goes to the Mount of Olives to spend the entire night in prayer. (4)

- 1 Bundy, Walter E., "Our Recovery of Jesus", p. 293
- 2 Matt. 14:23
- 3 Mark 1:37-38
- 4 John 8:1

We also read of a section of his ministry spent "in desert places", perhaps implying, apart from certain contextual considerations, a certain personal love of solitude. (1)

Jeremiah too spends much time alone, involved in contemplation. He conceives the prophet as "standing in Jehovah's council to perceive and hear his word. (Jer. 23:18) He must stand "as a fenced city, and an iron pillar, and as brazen walls against the while land". (Jer. 15:20) Says Dr. G.G. Findlay "Behind the contest waged by Jeremiah with kings and people there lay an interior struggle lasting more than twenty years. So long it took this great prophet to accept with full acquiescence the burden laid upon him". (2) "Jeremiah's call found him a diffident and reluctant young man--not wanting in devotion, but shrinking from publicity, and with no natural drawing toward the prophetic career. Yet, he is 'set over nations to pluck up and to break down, to build and to plant'. Already there begins the struggle between the implanted word of Jehovah and the nature of the man, on which turns Jeremiah's inner history and the development of his heroic character". (3)

But from these periods of natural recoil and predisposition to quiet solitariness, we find that the workings of inner presentments of duty drive them forth into voicing their attitudes toward the group around about them. Neither of them was in any sense antisocial. On the contrary, both of them deeply yearned for sympathy and understanding on the part of the people about them.

1 Mark 6:32, Matt. 14:13, Luke 4:42.

2 Findlay, G.G., Hasting's Dict. of the Bible, Art. "Jeremiah" p.434

3 ibid

The depth of Jehovah's love and the tenderness of His divine compassion were greatly intensified by the fact that both men loved people sincerely and were pained at the heart that it was so frequently necessary for them to bear unwelcomed messages. Dr. Hastings says concerning Jeremiah, "With Hosea, whose language and ideas made the deepest impression upon him, he must have recognized the closest kinship, in experience as well as in thought. Both lived in the deep shadow of a national catastrophe which they were powerless to avert. Both were rejected by their contemporaries, and both were capable of the most intense happiness, yet were denied all the joys which their age held dear". (1) If we substitute the name of Jesus for that of Hosea with regard to reactions of the men, the truth will equally hold. Both lived in the deep shadow of a national catastrophe, that of Jeremiah being the captivity of the people by Babylon and that of Jesus being the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Both being rejected by their contemporaries were truly "men of sorrows and acquainted with grief". Yet, both were capable of the truest social longings and disappointments.

Not only was the condition one of longing for social adjustment and recognition before the people at large, but one of bitter disappointment that even kinsmen were utterly failing to appreciate the prophetic duty. "We can hardly wonder that Jeremiah's pessimistic messages made him enemies but we can understand that the solitary man found a peculiar bitterness in his lot in that those most nearly attached to him by ties of blood were alienated by his preaching". Then it was that "the sensitive Jeremiah,

1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible", p. 228

deprived of sympathy which he had the most right to look for, broke out into imprecations of his own birth, prayed for vengeance on his enemies, and even reproached his God for bringing him into this unbearable situation". (1) Here we have a notable contrast with Jesus. He too was cursed by his age but, in the very hour of his death at their hands, he prayed "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do". There is no record that Jesus ever cursed the day of his birth or in any way gave place to vengeance upon his enemies. Yet, there came a time in his life when his own brethren believed him to be insane. (2) His answer to these things is not imprecation, but in the face of all the tide of personal provocation, he calmly orders the very materials of his sorrow into one more dramatic moment for the transmission of his prophetic message. (3)

Certainly the true social longing in the heart of Jesus was no whit less than in that of Jeremiah. That longing he carried with him down to the cross. Even a few days before the final end, he stood on a hill overlooking his beloved Jerusalem and with outstretched arms, voiced his solitary wail over a city of such a history and such an end. (4)

Both men were humanly desirous of a kindly approach to the people. Dr. Geo. A. Barton declares that Jeremiah "revived the main features of the teaching of Hosea, dwelling as Hosea had done, on the love of Yahweh, and interpreting the covenant between Yahweh and Israel as a covenant of marriage. In tenderness and depth of feeling he surpasses all his predecessors except Hosea". (5)

1 Smith, Henry Preserved, "The Religion of Israel", p. 166

2 Mark 3:21

3 Mark 10:29-30

4 Luke 13:34

5 Barton Geo. A., "The Religion of Israel" p. 122 f

Hastings adds his testimony at this point. Jeremiah was "a man of tender, loving, yielding, deeply impressible spirit. Jeremiah loved his country intensely. He would have given all he had to see Judah flourish, Jerusalem prosper; and lo, we see him compelled by his destiny to announce to his fellow citizens nothing but misfortune. Yet, we may recognize in Jeremiah's character a special fitness for his mission. That tender, shrinking sympathy could more fully feel, and more adequately express the ineffable divine sorrow over the guilty people, the eternal love which was never stronger than at the moment when it seemed to have been metamorphosed into bitter wrath and implacable vengeance." (1)

The prophets considered themselves responsible before God and, hence, must speak their messages. Yet, we are not to imagine that the people who heard and felt this deep note of social concern were entirely impervious to it. Jeremiah did have a few friends. A few there were who were drawn to him and, in a sense at least, shared with him. Certainly at least one was completely on his side. Baruch, his faithful amanuensis, was completely won. The full and sympathetic confidence of even one man must have proven a great source of strength to him. Furthermore, a large number must have regarded him with respect. If no one respected him and no one felt deeply affected by his messages, he would have constituted no sort of a menace to his enemies and would have probably been simply ignored. The very fact that his messages contained great power and had to be squarely faced by the whole nation, calling down even the attention of the king,

1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible" p. 233.

attests the fact that many there were who had not lost their estimation of the man. He was not altogether without allies and helpers. Even the king, though in a weak and timid fashion, befriended him and actually sought his advice. (1)

What has been said for Jeremiah at this point can also be largely said for Jesus. Josephus tells us that the common people heard him gladly. (2) The gospel stories tell of the huge multitudes who heard him. (3) Twelve there were who made it their sole business to always accompany him, wait on his needs, and spread his faith. (4) We are even told that his enemies, the Scribes and Pharisees were afraid to take him, the people being his supporters. (5)

Perhaps it would not be afieled for us to say that the very fact that so many heard both Jeremiah and Jesus and genuinely entered into sympathetic identification with the prophets only intensified the social sensitiveness of the men that those who controlled the social order should have been so blind and should have themselves become the stumbling-blocks in the way of the true deliverance.

- 1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible", p. 237
- 2 Josephus, Flavius, The Works of, Bk. XVIII, Chap. III, p. 535
- 3 Matt. 9:33, 21:9
- 4 Matt. 10:1
- 5 John 7:30, 44 and 8:29.

CHAPTER THREE. A COMPARISON OF MESSAGE AS TO STATE

At the outset of our consideration of the messages of Jeremiah and of Jesus, let us bear in mind that our purpose in this chapter is by no means to provide a compendium of specific utterance from the two men as they may detailedly bear upon each other. Such a task is the work of a book rather than a chapter. Furthermore, to engross ourselves in such a procedure would mean that we would fail in getting the focus of the general bearing of the relationship of the two men as message bearers. Hence, we propose, in keeping with our initial purpose of general evaluation, to consider the men in their utterances upon affairs of state, upon the affairs of the ecclesiastical system (involving the religious leadership of Israel), and upon the affairs of individuals, particularly with reference to their own religious lives and their own needs.

We do not consider such a division an arbitrary one. The prophets as a class stood related to the people in these three characteristic ways. Perhaps it would be fair to say that as a class their first consideration was in the affairs of state. The greater weight of the testimony in the case of Jeremiah would fall to his interest in the individual. Yet, at certain times and under certain circumstances each of the three was paramount and took entire precedence over everything else. The very intensity of the prophetic life demanded this. The men themselves made no formal attempt to grade the degrees of their interest. Whatever concerned the will of their God was the

CHAPTER THREE. A COMPARISON OF MESSAGE AS TO STATE

At the outset our consideration of the message of Jeremiah and of Jesus, let us bear in mind that our purpose in this chapter is by no means to provide a comparison of specific utterance from the two men as they may be found in their own utterances. Such a task is the work of a book rather than a chapter. Furthermore, to compare ourselves in such a procedure would mean that we would fail in getting the focus of the general bearing of the relationship of the two men as message bearers. Hence, we propose, in keeping with our initial purpose of general evaluation, to consider the men in their utterances upon matters of state, upon the affairs of the ecclesiastical system (involving the religious leadership of Israel), and upon the affairs of individuals, particularly with reference to their own religious lives and their own needs.

We do not consider even a division an arbitrary one. The prophets as a class stood related to the people in these three characteristic ways. Perhaps it would be fair to say that as a class their first consideration was in the affairs of state. The greater weight of the testimony in the case of Jeremiah would fall to his interest in the individual. Yet, as certain times and under certain circumstances each of the three was paramount and took entire precedence over everything else. The very intensity of the prophetic life transcended this. The men themselves made no formal attempt to grade the degree of their interest. Whatever concerned the will of their God was the

transcendent topic of the hour. The cause of Righteousness was not weakened by any idea of segmentation. All life held together. The prophet's message, then, stood related to the people in no less than three distinct characteristics, as simple individuals, as an ecclesiastical organism, and as a state. (1)

The prophet considered that the constitution of his government was that of a state of which God was king. He felt himself charged with leading that state on to its true consummation. So, he became a statesman. No land has seen loftier patriotism or profounder political wisdom than these prophets displayed. Nor, has the love of country ever led to greater sacrifices than were borne by Jeremiah and Isaiah, and Micah ben Imlah. (2)

In order to be true to such a function, it was frequently necessary for Jeremiah to rebuke his people. For instance, when Jehoiakim decided to throw off the yoke of Nebuchadrezzar, Jeremiah advised strongly against it, rebuked the perfidy of the unwise king, and even declared that the lordship of Nebuchadrezzar was in conformity to the plan of Yahweh. Jeremiah spared no pains to keep his country from plunging into suicidal revolt, declaring that submission to Nebuchadrezzar was the only possible escape from further calamity and destruction. (3) It seemed that just one man in all Judah saw the folly of this revolt, that one man being the prophet. He not only warned the king in the face of grave personal danger to be faithful to his Babylonian overlord, but he combatted the crazy notion, inherited from Isaiah, that Jerusalem could never be taken. But all to no purpose. His

1 Davidson, A.B. "Old Testament Prophecy", p. 106

2 *ibid*, p. 110.

3 Bailey, Albert E., and Kent, Chas. Foster, "History of the Hebrew Commonwealth", p. 242f. Jeremiah 29:21, 32:28.

first roll of sermons was cut in pieces by the king personally.

For practical purposes, Jeremiah's prophecies as a statesman may be summed up as those concerning Judah and Jerusalem, and those against foreign nations. (1) We are not, however, to think of any clear principle as determining their arrangements. Anyone who reads the prophecies as they come may easily find himself in a state of constant bewilderment as he moves back and forth along the prophet's career or, still worse, find no clue apart from his general knowledge of the historic background which would give him the situation or period of the prophet's life reflected in the portion he may be reading. (2) Hence, we must make our own evaluations in the light of history and the development of the prophet's own career.

While we have cited his most notable work as a statesman in his strong rebuke of king Jehoiakim and the policy he represented toward Nebuchadrezzar, we must understand this in the light of what had gone before. Jeremiah first comes on the scene of action as a young man warning against the devastations of the Scythians. He freely predicts the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem. (3) They are to him a great and boiling cauldron which is overpouring upon the face of the entire land. This Scythian scare failed to materialize and some scholars believe that here we have an indication of the real reason why they are followed with a period of silence on the part of the prophet. But it is more probable that he visioned the wrath from the North as only delayed for a season. Certainly, this supposed

1 Eiselen, Frederick Carl, "The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament" Vol. 1, p. 252.

2 *ibid*, p. 251

3 Jer. chap. 6.

failure had no effect in turning his mind from thoughts of terror as coming from the North and the very fact that these records concerning the Scythian invasion were carefully preserved along with his later prophecies strongly suggests that he did not personally regard them as failures at all. (1) We are to see in these early prophecies the fact that the young prophet is aware to Judah's real source of danger from the North. He has decided that his work as a prophet shall be in close harmony with that of an alert student of contemporary events. He is intensely interested and alarmed at the growing powers and their movements and understands Judah's wellnigh indefensible and helpless position. Yet, the whole scheme of things represents the divine vengeance. (2) The destruction which is to follow will come as a direct result of disobedience. (3) These things are the immediate judgments of the holy and righteous God who has been so wilfully and so grossly offended by his stiffnecked and rebellious people. In the face of such social and moral conditions as obtain under the very eyes of the prophet in Jerusalem, the destruction of the sacred city itself is inevitable. (4)

When we consider our chapter on the personality of the man and now consider the terrible note of judgment which he is forced to sound, we are reminded of the words of Prof. Frederick Carl Eiselen when he says "Is not the victory of a constitution timid and shrinking a nobler moral triumph than that of a man who never knew fear--who marches to the conflict with others with a light heart, simply because it is his nature to do so - because he has

- 1 Knudson, Albert C. "The Beacon Lights of Prophecy", p. 176
- 2 Jer. 5:1 - 6:30
- 3 Jer. 8:4 9:1
- 4 Jer. 21:1-10.

not had experience of a previous conflict with self?" (1) Such prophecies must have constituted a great trial within the breast of Jeremiah and we can only too well imagine what a relief it must have meant personally for him to occasionally break through to ideas of ultimate peace and restoration. But we must not commit the mistake of believing that all his consolation lay in the dim and distant future. "In the prophecies belonging to the earlier period, a note of hope is still discernable. Judah may yet repent; if so, the severest blow may yet be averted; hence the frequent exhortation to repentance". (2)

But when the years passed without improvement, the prophet lost hope of a general turning to Yahweh, (3) became convinced that Yahweh's patience was exhausted and that neither his own prayers, (4) nor even the prayers of Moses and Samuel could change Yahweh's purpose to cast the people out of his sight. (5)

Then it was that the essential love and tenderness of the great, prophetic heart was forced to other consolations than those of any event of the present. From the sins of the present and the judgments which he expected to fall in the near future Jeremiah now must turn to the more remote future. Beyond the night of calamity and disaster he saw the dawn of a brighter day. The nation may perish but the kingdom of Yahweh must endure. There are various promises of restoration interspersed here and there, but they are especially to be found in chapters 30 and 33, which have been called "A Book of Consolation". (6) From these various

1 Eiselen, Frederick Carl, "The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament". p. 308

2 *ibid* p. 310 and Jeremiah 4:3, 4 6:8 7:3

3 Jer. 18:12

4 Jer. 7:16 and 14:2

(5) Jer. 15:1, 2.

6 Eiselen, Frederick Carl, "The Proph. of the O.T." p. 311

indications of the brighter day ahead we seem to discern more or less definite elements operative in this consolation of the future.

The first of these elements we name as "The Preservation of the Remnant". These faithful ones who survive the awful days of purging and fire will constitute the true Israel. They will be saved as a nucleus of the new kingdom of Yahweh. (1) The second element seems to be marked by restoration from exile. Here the prophet believes that the hour of Babylon's downfall will be the time of the exile's restoration. (2) Third, there is to issue from all this a new and a purged Jerusalem, one that will truly serve Yahweh and keep his statutes. (3) Lastly, but by no means least in view of our comparison, we have the idea of the ideal king. In the new and purged and sanctified Jerusalem an ideal king will rule over the restored remnant. "The throne of David had been disgraced by a succession of worthless kings who had only hastened Judah to her ruin. In the new era a different type of ruler will occupy the throne". (4)

The chief ruler will be a descendant of David. (5) He will in reality be a kind of second David. (6) He will represent in his judgment and general disposition a man after God's own heart and will have free access to him. (7) In other words, the reign of this righteous and ideal ruler will come as truly representative of the lordship of Yahweh.

As a fifth principle of consolation we have the idea of the

1 Jer. 4:27, 5:10, 29:11, 31:11, 46:28.

2 Jer. 30:7-11 (3) Jer. 30:23-25

4 Eiselen, Fred. Carl, "The Proph. Bks. of the O. T." p. 312

5 Jer. 23:5, 6

6 Jer. 30:9

7 Jer. 30:21

new covenant. While this may truly be considered as a kind of capstone to the processes of future consolation for Israel, it may also be considered as an inevitable expression of the personal religion of the man. We have preferred to give it a major emphasis at this latter point. It is sufficient here to say that Jeremiah considered that the covenant made at Sinai had failed to accomplish its purpose due to its own inherent weakness. (1) An effective covenant is not operative by compulsion from without. It must be the principle of impulsion as an outgrowth of mutual affection.

Now we come to ask ourselves in the light of all the foregoing as to just what were the lines of comparison between Jeremiah and Jesus from the point of view of statesmanship. A superficial view would probably be inclined to consider the relationship slight. Indeed, if one is willing to satisfy himself with a single proof text, he may be able after a fashion to defend the idea that Jesus would have nothing to do with the state, that he even considered religion and statecraft as two entirely distinct and mutually separate connections. (2) We greatly prefer, however, to stand with Prof. W. P. Paterson when he says "We are accustomed to think of the opposition to Jesus as due to a temporary ascendance of a diabolic element in human nature, but as a fact the hatred of the principal parties, and the murderous conspiracy in which it issued, are too easily intelligible from the point of view of average political action. The chief responsibility rests with the Sadducees, who dominated the Sanhedrin,

4 Jer. 11:8, 31:32

5 Matt. 22:21, Mark 12:17.

and who set in motion the machinery of the law. They were the statesmen and the ecclesiastics, and it is the recognized business of the statesman to maintain social order, and of the ecclesiastic to defend the interests of an institution, by such measures as the exigencies of the case seem to demand. And, if they were convinced that the popular excitement aroused by Jesus was likely to be made a pretext by the Romans for depriving them of the last vestiges of national existence (Jn 11:48) and if, on the other hand, His reforming zeal in the temple was an attack on one of the sources of the revenue of the priesthood (Mk 11:15-18), they could claim that what they did was to perform an administrative act under the compulsion of higher expediency.

(1) Hence, instead of beholding Jesus as one who punctiliously and coolly kept himself aloof from the political situation, we find him, like Jeremiah, heavily engrossed in that type of reforming zeal which was so extremely vital to state as to, in the end, invoke the joint powers of church and state in the radical move to destroy the prophet and rid themselves of his message.

Now just what were the reasons for the violent antipathy between Jesus and the state of his day? First of all, Jesus was a savior, an answer to those who had been "looking for the consolation of Israel". (2) This had come to be popularly interpreted as one who would re-establish the throne of David after a material pattern. It was to people like the Zealots a day when Yahweh would deal rigorously with the oppressive Romans and restore to Israel the former glories of David and of Solomon. To Jesus himself the

1 Hastings, James, "Dictionary of the Bible". Art. on "Jesus Christ". by W. P. Paterson. p. 453.

2 Luke 2:25

idea of the "kingdom of God" was central. Frequently he did not even take the trouble to make himself clear to the people that he was not speaking about an earthly sovereignty. (1) Naturally, news of this kind in the ears of the Roman could have only one meaning. To them it would mean that one more senseless Jew has audaciously lifted himself against the power of the Caesar. It was no uncommon thing for such a free lance to appear and the Roman method of dealing with him had long since been well defined. (2)

While the reason just cited was probably central to the political trouble of Jesus, there was another contributing element which more closely resembles the position of Jeremiah. Jesus, like Jeremiah, was a prophet of doom. He probably freely accepted the current Jewish apocalypticism of the day. He believed that a new world order was soon to ensue. The old order of things was bad. A great change was ahead. It was his supreme mission to prepare the hearts and consciences of his fellow countrymen to a state of readiness for this new order of things. This in itself may easily be looked upon as highly uncomplimentary to Roman control. The existing order was the Roman order. If it was so bad as to be dashed in pieces by the righteous judgment of God, it was certainly far too bad to sustain the loyalty and obedience of its present subjects. We can readily see how any Roman would have considered the general teachings of Jesus as highly subversive to the power of Rome. (3) While the bulk of the opposition during the active ministry of Jesus came from the Pharisees as the custodians of the sacred Law, in the end the underlying meanings of

1 Luke 4:43, 6:20, etc.

2 Case, Shirley Jackson. "Jesus - A New Biography". p. 318 f.

3 Stevens, George Barker, "The Theology of the New Testament", p 152

his utterances called down upon his head the Sadducees and the Sanhedrin, who were joint custodians of religion and government and, through them, easily set off the swift treatment of Rome.

On the other hand, just how deeply Jesus was influenced by Jeremiah's prophecies of the future ideal kingdom and king with regard to his own ideas of himself with relation to Messiahship, is a matter of great diversity of opinion among scholars. Case believes that Jesus entertained no such idea, but that what has come to be considered as such claims are representative of the spirit and need of a later gospel making age. (1)

Jesus as a Jew shared the apocalyptic developments of later Judaism. These as we have seen, were so stressed as to contribute to political hostility against him. Yet the same source that tended to involve him in trouble with the political authorities tended to accent his power as a teacher. Out of this same later Judaism with its Rabbinic lore had come many of his greatest ideas.

Over against Jesus the Jew we have Jesus the religious genius. In this respect, while we may or may not stand with Case as to his consciousness of Messiahship, we must recognize that the whole prophetic movement reached its climax in him. "The atmosphere into which Jesus came was charged with externalism----and Jesus' opposition to the leading party of his day, Pharisaism, was aroused by the same legalistic tendencies that involved the denunciations of the prophets. The resemblance does not stop with a criticism of the times made by both prophets and Jesus, but holds likewise in the case of their message and their final outcome.---- It is true that Jesus fell heir to legalistic Judaism as well as

1 Case, Shirley Jackson, "Jesus - A New Biography", p. 105.

to prophetism----Jesus attitude and whole spirit, however, were clearly a continuation of the prophetic message". (1) In this connection, Jesus, like Jeremiah, offended the Temple authorities and hastened his arrest.

Hence in his central message of the Kingdom of God we have a fusion of the national and individual consciousness, the flower alike of legalism and of prophetism at their highest estate. While the Kingdom He has in mind is to mean "the consolation of Israel", the fruition of Jewish hopes and the true fulfilment of her law, it is, at the same time, to rest upon the prepared heart and conscience of the individual "in love rather than law, service rather than sacrifice, righteousness rather than ritual". Matt. 5:17-48----a repudiation of that type of legalism which found its peace in external ceremony.

1 Methodist Review, September-October 1928
Article on "Legalism and Prophetism", Dr. Fred G. Bratton
p. 738 f.

to prophecies--Jesus' attitude and whole spirit, however, were
clearly a demonstration of the prophetic message. (1) In this
connection, Jesus, like Jeremiah, offered the people a spiritual
and personal life.

Jesus in his central message of the Kingdom of God we have
a fusion of the national and individual consciousness, the
flower alike of Judaism and of prophecy as their highest
expression. While the Kingdom he was in mind is so near "and
connection of Israel," the Kingdom of Jesus hopes and the
true fulfillment of her law, it is, at the same time, to rest
upon the prophetic heart and conscience of the individual in love
rather than law, service rather than sacrifice, righteousness
rather than ritual. Matt. 5:17-48--a revelation of that
type of Judaism which found its peace in external ceremony.

CHAPTER FOUR - THE MESSAGE TO THE INDIVIDUAL.

Before the day of Jeremiah the national aspect of Israel's religion had been emphasized almost to the exclusion of the individual. This nationalized faith very naturally yielded itself to forms and institutions. Jeremiah saw that the national life of Judah was rapidly nearing its close. He saw that if the true religion of Jehovah was to be preserved, it must be itself denationalized. It must be individual and spiritual. (1) Important as are the prophecies others contribute, Jeremiah's redefinition of religion in terms of the individual heart obedience and devotion ~~devotion~~ is of the most permanent value. With Jeremiah religion is an immediate and personal relationship between Yahweh and the individual. When all individuals enjoy this personal fellowship, then a similar relationship becomes possible between Yahweh and the redeemed remnant as a whole. (2)

This individualization of religion explains several other points in the teaching of Jeremiah. Jeremiah believes in personal responsibility. With the sense of the individual lost, persons may easily think that they are to be punished for the sins of other people, sins committed either by some of their contemporaries or by their ancestors. (3) Conscious personal fellowship with God, on the other hand, creates a deeper sense of individual accountability. Here men begin to realize that everyone is responsible for his own conduct. (4)

So mighty is the working of this unique principle in the

- 1 Eiselen, Frederick Carl, "Prophecy and the Prophets" p. 313
- 2 Jer. 24:7
- 3 Jer. 31:29
- 4 Jer. 31:30.

mind of Jeremiah that we even find it coloring for him his attitude toward those who are beyond the national boundaries. The destiny of foreign nations, it follows from his new definition of religion, does not depend upon their acceptance of membership in the national organization of the 'chosen people', but upon their own individual relations to Yahweh. When, as a result of his wonderful manifestations in the history of Israel, they come to recognize him as the true God, they too will find their places among the redeemed. (1)

In the light of Jeremiah's strong individualization of religion, we are to understand his tremendous antipathy toward any sort of real dependance upon mere external symbols. When the immediate presence of Yahweh is realized, people may disregard the emblems of the old religion. This thought is most clearly expressed in the announcement that in the new age the need of the ark will be no longer felt. (2) The ark hitherto had, in the imagination of every devout Israelite, been a symbol of the presence of Yahweh, but when Yahweh himself is in the midst of his people and his presence is realized in the hearts and lives of his individual worshippers, no one will have any genuine use of such visible reminders of His concern and comradeship.

Now Jeremiah's messages to the individual, in consonance with this tremendous redefinition of religion, are twofold. First, he is concerned with the leaders as individuals, representing as they do so much power and responsibility before men and God. Second, he is immensely concerned with the men who mis-

1 Jer. 16:19, 3:17, 4:2, 33:9

2 Jer. 3:16

takenly look up to them for spiritual wisdom and example.

In Jeremiah VII we are made to see a most terrible condition. Judah is filled with oppression, bloodshed, impurity, idolatry. Such things filled the land and, for these things, Jeremiah threatens divine judgment which the temple and its ritual can do nothing to avert. It would be a mistake, as is sometimes done, to charge that these terrible conditions were directly traceable to a false spirit of teaching in the Deuteronomic Code. In this code the idea of sin is never connected with the materials of ritual. (1) A sin means a crime, an offence to law and to justice. (2) It is an act of heathenism. (3) It is a breach of faith toward Jehovah. (4) A lack of kindness toward the poor comes under such a heading. (5) Such offenses are not done away simply because the offender maintains the punctilium of sacrifices, but are punishable at the hands of man and of God. It is true, however, that this moral side of the law continued to be neglected in Judah. But responsibility for such a neglect must be laid at the doors of those whose business it was to spiritually guide the people and not to the law itself. We may, of course, say that the psychology of a great deal of legalism might easily become that of a false trust in legal processes themselves.

Not only are we to be careful of the degree of blame for adverse conditions which we lay at the door of the Deuteronomic Code, but we are to realize that the reform movement under the young king Josiah, while far from perfect, was by no means such as would arouse the indignation of Jeremiah. Israel's apostate

- 1 Smith, W. Robertson, "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church" p. 372
- (2) Jer. XIX 15, XXI 26, XXI 22, XXIV 16
- 3 Jer. XX 18
- (4) Jer. XXIII 21, 22
- 5 Jer. XXIV 15

condition was vitiating her spiritual power. Her worship was scattered, irregular, and often contaminated by unfaithful local influences. "With the reform of Josiah and the drastic measures taken by him a repetition of these ancient corruptions was made impossible. Here the long compromise between the worship of the one true God and the superstitions of the native races of Palestine practically come to an end". (1) Worship is centered at Jerusalem where the sacrifices are offered in the Temple alone and under proper regulations and competent supervision. Certainly, a man like Jeremiah could have seen no objection in a procedure aimed at such an abuse.

The brunt of the responsibility for Judah's perverted condition, in the mind of Jeremiah, must rest with her corrupt and unworthy leaders. As he views their selfishness, their oppression, their blindness, he is made to cry aloud "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem and see now and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if any can find a man, if there be any one who executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth, and I will pardon. Though they say 'The Lord liveth', they swear falsely. O Lord are not thine eyes upon the truth? Thou hast stricken them but they have not grieved. Thou hast consumed them, but they refuse to receive correction. They have made their faces harder than a rock. They have refused to return. Therefore, I said 'Surely these are poor and foolish, for they know not the ways of the Lord, nor their judgments of their God. I will get me unto the great men and I will speak unto them, for they have known the

1 Foakes-Jackson, F. J. "The Biblical History of the Hebrews" p. 304

way of the Lord and the judgments of their God, but these have altogether broken the yoke and burst the bond". (1)

Here Jeremiah deliberately reviews the terrible condition of the land and then quite as deliberately traces the perfidy to those who sit in the seats of the mighty. The poor people can rise to no higher levels than their leaders are able to set for them. We can still feel the bitterness of the great prophet's soul when he cries, "A lion out of the forests shall slay them!" Yet, the priests consecrated to Yahweh are no better than the leaders in general. "The priests said not 'Where is the Lord?' and they that handled the law knew me not; the pastors also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal, and walked after things that do not profit". (2) The spirit of divine inquiry had departed from the only source in the wide world where the people had a right to expect that they should invariably find it. In the heat of the prophet's indignation, he is made to feel that such perfidy against God actually represents a diabolical conspiracy wherein prophets make God say whatever they care to have him say and the priests, in turn, promote and defend their wilful lies. (3)

Citations might easily be multiplied to continue the prophet's rebuke to these shameless and self-possessed men who called themselves the spiritual guides of Israel. From the prophet's descriptions of them, they appear wellnigh hopeless. But they are not all. The very definition of Jeremiah concerning religion, while it drove him to the bitterest kind of attack upon the

1 Jer. 5:1-5

2 Jer. 2:8

3 Jer. 5:30f

leaders, also drove him to a direct spirit of appeal to the individual Israelite as such. While he brooked not to challenge king Jehoiakim himself for 'building his house in unrighteousness' (1), he must not overlook that individual possibility of spiritual repentance on the part of the common man. As Prof. Cornill has pointed out, Jeremiah believed that "every man as such is born a child of God. He does not become such through the forms of any definite religion or outward organization, but he becomes such in his heart, through circumcision of the heart and of the ears". (2) If such is his true religion, then it must be possible for him to act even if such action must be taken independently of organized religion and outer forms. Prof. Cornill asserts that it was Jeremiah who first coined the phrase about "Jehovah trying the heart and the reins". (3) If this is true, then we probably see the driving motive in the man who had to stand alone with all his world against him and invite men for their very souls'sake to break with all that called itself religion around about them. The procedure for them will be a safe one if done in humility and sincerity, since God sees the conditions around them and the inner reasons for their independent actions.

Jeremiah continues to reinforce his appeal straight to the people by holding up before them the examples of others who had far less to live for and yet, under the utmost temptation and pressure upon them, have preserved for themselves glorious records of fidelity and covenant keeping. The Rechabites have

1 Smith, J.M.P., "The Prophets and their Times", p 134

2 Cornill, Carl Heinrich, "The Prophets of Israel", p 98

3 ibid page 97

for centuries never tasted wine because their founder so taught and pledged them. (1) The very heathen nations around them have preserved remarkable love and loyalty to Gods which are really no Gods at all. How much more should children of Yahweh be willing to do? (2)

Every avenue of approach was brought to bear upon the people by the ardent and urgent prophet. On one occasion he even felt himself constrained to station himself in the very gate of the Lord's house and there, as the worshippers drew nigh, actually seek to divert them from their intention of entering that they may give their souls to genuine spiritual experience. It was then that he cried "Amend your ways and your doings and Jehovah will cause you to dwell in this place. Trust not in lying words saying 'The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord are these'. For, if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings, if ye thoroughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbor, if ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other Gods to your hurt, then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers forever and ever". (3) Most of the scholars seem to feel that, in the earlier stages of the prophetic utterances Jeremiah was genuinely hopeful for Israel and pushed the question of repentance as a method of warding off impending danger but, as matters grew worse, he became convinced that destruction of the existing order was of God and that nothing less drastic would answer the need of the people.

1 Jer. 35:1-10

2 Cornill, Carl Heinrich, "The Prophets of Israel", p 97.

3 Jer. 7:1-7

Jesus is never a closer parallel to Jeremiah than at the points just discussed. He too was continually in trouble with the leaders. He too despaired that the true fruits of God could ever come of them. He too felt compelled to take his case before the people.* The motive behind such action, as in the case of Jeremiah, was Jesus' conception of religion in terms of the individual, his possibilities with God and his inescapable responsibilities. Says Prof. Wendt, "All through his teaching Jesus has held that the existence and value of righteousness are solely determined by the inward man or the heart (καρδιά). In the eyes of men we may pass for righteous because of our external words and acts; but God sees in the secret places, (Matt. 6:4, 6, 18) and knows the heart (Luke 16:15). He judges according to the state of the heart". (1)

Jesus' famous illustration of the Pharisee and the Publican in the temple praying is another case in point. The Pharisee belongs to a powerful and sacerdotal class. He keeps the ritual. The law and the temple are his peculiar possession. No nicety of religious mannerism is left unattended. On the other hand, the poor publican represents no such traditions. He belongs to no powerful system in religion. He is despised by the prouder Israelites. Yet, in his simple sob of prayer, his soul goes out to meet the Heavenly Father. The difference is clear in the mind of Jesus. One man went down to his home as having cleared one more item from the chores of his daily routine. The other went down with the love and grace of God in his heart and an

1 Wendt, Hans Heinrich, "The teachings of Jesus", p 265

experience of having been justified. (1)

Prof. Wendt believes that the real significance of the position of the Sermon on the Mount as coming at the beginning of Jesus' ministry is to sound the keynote of his work and message as a whole. We do not, however, need to believe that all this discourse as recorded by Matthew was actually given on a single occasion. Luke distributes the discourse. It probably represents a summary of the main teachings of Jesus given originally at different times. All precepts and ceremonials of righteousness are insufficient. God must reign in the heart of the individual. (2) Many of the parables of Jesus are directly designed to show how earnestly and how patiently the Heavenly Father works for even one sinner who may be made to turn. The Parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, the Prodigal Son all have such an emphasis. (3) Here we may say that there is presented an ascending scale of values, the individual as the value of a coin, the individual as the value of a sheep, and the individual as the value of a well-beloved son. (4) Again, it is one sheep in a hundred; it is one coin in ten, it is one son in two. Prof. Dargan takes these things to indicate the extreme desire of Jesus that the people should not underestimate their value before God simply as individuals.

This great love of the people, as in the case of Jeremiah, drove Jesus to fierce indignation against the corrupt leaders who used the people only as so much spoil. The poor people were given to understand that zeal in the matter of proselyting

1 Luke XVIII.

2 Wendt, Hans Henrich, "The Teachings of Jesus", p. 267

3 Luke 15:4-32

4 Dargan, E. C., "The Changeless Christ", p 113

was a true missionary impulse when, as a matter of fact, it was only a greedy, selfish satisfaction in seeing their own legalistic pedantry grow. "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, you make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves". (1)

Jesus viewed the scribes and pharisees as men vastly more concerned in smooth little twists of casuistry than in the real business of helping the souls of the people. "Woe unto you, blind guides, which say, 'Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple he is a debtor'. Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?" (2) In fact, wide sections of Jesus' teaching are given over in an effort to steer the people away from their dependence upon the Scribes and Pharisees as their spiritual leaders. He gives all his hearers to understand, in one of these general broadsides against them, that their zeal for the fine points of the law and the traditions of the elders does not rest upon zeal for God at all nor upon any kind of real spiritual communion with him, but upon an overweening desire to be seen of men, to exercise power over men, and to hold for themselves positions of honor before men. (3)

Again, Jesus, as Jeremiah, felt the pressure of emergency as he pled with the people. He too must warn them of impending danger and doom. He takes his place along with the many earnest prophets of Israel who warned their contemporaries of disaster

1 Matt. 23:15

2 Matt. 23:16f

3 Matt. 23: 4-9

ahead. However kind and long suffering God might be, there surely would come a day of reckoning when sinners would be called to account. A holy God could not forever endure a sinful people. When the prophet's own experiences and the signs of the times pointed to an early intervention from heaven to reverse the present evil course of events, the first duty that lay to the hand of a preacher was to summon his kinsmen to repentance and new consecration in preparation for the approaching day of judgment. "The new age would break suddenly, like a flash of lightning shooting across the whole expanse of the heavens, in the twinkling of an eye. There would be no opportunity to perceive the gradual approach by observation and reckoning". (1) This approaching doom of Jesus corresponds to the approaching dangers from the North told by Jeremiah. In both cases the blow is to fall because of individual sin and perversity and in both cases the disaster itself is to come by the plan and will of God. Further, in both cases the destruction is to work out the disciplinary purpose of the Almighty, for Jeremiah in the idea of the Remnant and of future restoration; for Jesus it is the idea of a completely new human order, the kingdom of God among men.

Both men see in individual repentance whereby the common man by a dead lift of faith extricates himself from the present and sinful order of things the only shadow of a real remedy. Wherever this is perfected in the individual heart and a vital and personal relationship with the holy God comes to pervade one's motives and actions, that one person will be sheltered and protected by God whatever becomes of the nation.

1 Case, Shirley Jackson, "Jesus - A New Biography", p. 423
 Luke 17:22-37

Both men stepped out boldly upon divine faith. So sure was Jesus that everything would happen just as he predicted that ~~that~~ even the burial of the dead could well be neglected in the face of such a crisis. (1) Says Prof. J. M. P. Smith of Jeremiah, "He could not wait to see his way clear through his difficulties before going further with his work. He worked by faith, not by sight". (2) In the ecstasy of that same faith he seems to have literally seen himself as receiving the cup of Yahweh's wrath from His hands and proffering it, not only to Israel, but, in turn, to nation after nation that they may drink. (3)

In neither case are we to think of these messages as having been carefully organized in some quiet study and then leisurely given as from ^asnug pulpit. They were, on the contrary, evolved through the stress and strain of life. Their texts were the vital matters of the day. A tower has just fallen in Siloam. News is brought to Jesus. The news forthwith becomes his topic. (4) John's disciples fast while his do not. Word is brought to him in the presence of them all. The contrast becomes his lesson. (5) Again, John the Baptist sends messengers to learn more exactly of his claims of messiahship. The inquiry is immediately made public by Jesus and then, while all ears are keen, his lesson follows. (6) Many such instances could be multiplied to show how deftly and adroitly Jesus utilized the strategy of circumstance.

The whole work of Jeremiah is a utilization of this same principle. While all hearts trembled for fear of the rising peril

1 Luke 9:57, 62

2 Smith, J. M. P., "The Prophets and Their Times", p 139

3 Jer. 1:10, Smith J.M.P., "The Prophets and Their Times", p. 141

4 Luke 13:4 (5) Luke 5:33 (6) Matt. 11:2-10

of the North, Jeremiah stepped forward to tell them the meaning of it all.

Not only were these messages in both cases flung from the hot anvil of the soul amid the hammerings of immediate circumstance, but, with such deep surging, we are not to imagine anything lacking as to strength and vigor of style. Prof. Lindsay, Of Edinburgh, says of Luther that he wrote while the fire burned, even in great haste. (1) As these things seemed to promote the stylistic power of Luther, it was not different with Jeremiah and Jesus. The deep passion of soul struck out a language of power for itself. Dr. A. S. Peake does not agree with those who seem to minimize the style of Jeremiah. He believes that the diffuseness which characterizes the book is very probably responsible for the fact that the true stylistic power of Jeremiah is concealed from us. "His prophecies abound in concise and pregnant utterances which it is not easy to forget" (2) Some examples may be quoted.

"Is not my word fire, saith Jehovah; and as a forge hammerer that shatters the rocks?" (3) "For two evils have my people committed; Me have they forsaken, the fountain of living waters, to hew out for themselves cisterns, which hold no water". (4) "An appalling and a horrible thing has come to pass in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely and the priests teach at their beck, and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?" (5) "The harvest is past; the summer is ended, and we

1 Lindsay, Thomas M., "A History of the Reformation". Vol. 1. p.242

2 Peake, A.S., "The New Century Bible", Vol. 1, "Jeremiah", p 50

3 Jer. XXIII:29. (4) Jer. 11:3 (5) Jer. V:30, 31

are not saved". (1) "If thou hast run with the footmen and they have wearied thee, then how wilt thou strive with horses?" (2) "And if in a land of peace thou fleest, then how wilt thou do in the jungles of the Jordan?" (3) "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" (4) "Why is my pain perpetual and my wound incurable, which refuseth to be healed?" "Wilt thou indeed be unto me as a lying stream, as waters that are not sure?" (5)

The prophet's style is, as Dr. Peake states in his previous citations, a reflection on his personality. It is marked by deep sincerity and freedom from all that is artificial. It is an indication of his greatness that he should see the principle of Divine action in the most commonplace things.

Perfect agreement with Dr. Peake's position is taken by Prof. J.M.P. Smith when he says that if we could separate the genuine utterances of Jeremiah from the mass of later material attached to his name, we should doubtless be impressed with the freshness and vigor of his style, even as we are by the courage of his thought. (6)

Wide and variant have been the claims put forward concerning Jesus' force of style. It has even been argued philosophically apart from any record whatsoever that, granting his unique position in history, he must have incorporated in himself all the elements of Nth power vitality. Says Prof. MacIntosh, "Life for every moral agent lies open in the direction of the future. He is becoming that which he has not been and is not yet. He lives by

1 Jer. VIII:20

(2) Jer. XII:5

(3) Jer. XII:5

4 Jer. XIII:23

(5) Jer. XV:15.

6 Smith, J.M.P., "The Prophets and Their Times". p. 141

moving; to make the same choice forever would be to make no choice at all and, ipse facto, lapse from the moral plane. If then our Lord belongs to concrete history, His person cannot be a scene of stagnation; and the activity and movement constitutive of it is no mere evanescent accident, but the vital to his individuality". (1)

Wendt speaks at length of how Jesus used the strategy of circumstance and then concludes:

"By this method of meeting the want of the occasion Jesus has been able to impart two weighty qualities to His utterances and His instruction -viz., popular intelligibility and impressive pregnancy. The importance lies in the union of these two qualities. A mode of teaching which aims at popular intelligibility is exposed to the risk of degenerating into platitude and triviality, and obscure. But Jesus perfectly combined the two classic beauties of style. All the characteristic qualities and methods observable in His style can be classed under the head of means for obtaining those two special excellences". (2)

I have quoted at length because these words of Wendt seem to come to the very heart of the style of Jesus. Garvie corroborates these words of Wendt when he says that Jesus' teaching was never ephemeral, but that it was "eternal truth and grace which met the temporal occasion". The teaching was for the most part occasional, but always elevated and never trivial conversation, leading men out of the common life of the world into the presence of God Himself. (3) Again, says Garvie, "Men received from him as much as at the time they could accept, but in such a form that, with the development of their capacity for, there would be increase of their possession of the truth taught. There was not only open speech, but also reserve and suggestiveness of utterance". (4)

1 Mackintosh, H. R., "The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ" p. 492

2 Wendt, Hans Henrich, "The Teachings of Jesus", Vol. 1. p. 109

3 Garvie, Alfred Ernest, "The Christian Preacher", p. 34

4 ibid.

Further, the teachings of Jesus were generally given in pithy, pointed, clear, and forceful sayings. It was ^{with} Him multum in parvo. His statements are simple, felicitous, and easily remembered, yet every one of them is packed full of thought. Antithesis, epigram, paradox abound. Only a few of the possible number of illustrations need be stated. "For every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted". (1) "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners". (2) "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath". (3) "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for My sake and the gospel's shall save it". (4)

Many of these brief sayings present the truth in picture. There are abundant metaphors. Such images as leaven, (5) cup, (6) baptism, (7) ransom, (8) trumpet, (9) sheep's clothing, (10) lost sheep, (11) yoke, (12) good treasure, (13) flock, (14) fire, (15) will be readily recalled. Here in each instance a figure suggests a truth in the realm of spirit.

As Garvie so trenchantly points out, these metaphors are frequently allegorically expanded. Narrow gate, (16) plenteous harvest, (17) the mote and the beam, (18) the hand to the plough, (19) light, (20) darkness, (21) meat, (22) bread (23) water, (24) hunger, (25) thirst, (26) are among the ones that may be cited.

1 Lk. 14:11	(2) Mk. 2:17	(3) Mk. 2:27	(4) Mk. 8:25	(5) Mt. 13:33
6 Lk. 22:20	(7) Mk. 10:39	(8) Mt. 20:28	(9) Mt. 6:8	(10) Mt. 7:15
11 Mt. 15:24	(12) Mt. 11:29	(13) Mt. 12:35	(14) Mt. 26:31	
15 Mt. 3:10	(16) Mt. 7:13	(17) Lu. 10:2	(18) Mt. 7:3	(19) Lu. 9:62
20 Mt. 5:14	(21) Mt. 6:23	(22) Jno. 4:34	(23) Jno. 6:32	
24 Jno. 4:10	(25) Jno. 6:35	(26) Jno. 4:14		

CHAPTER FIVE - A COMPARISON OF METHODS.

While the matter of style, which has just engrossed us, is frequently treated as method, we have preferred to treat it under the idea of method as related to message, which it certainly is. When we dedicate this chapter to method we do not mean to reopen the matter of style as relating to message but, rather, to consider the way cleared to treat briefly of the general methods by which both men intended to pursue their careers and, in general, to accomplish their results. Hence, we shall here seek only to define for ourselves such considerations as how they sought to gain the public eye by means of general strategem and how they proposed that the impressions created by them should not be easily lost.

Without impinging upon what we have already said about style, we should, at the outset, remember that both men were story tellers. Says Hobhouse, "Story telling is an art which primitive man enjoys as much as his civilized fellows, and has had its share in peopling the world with spirits and heroes". (1) This most ancient vehicle of truth was used to the full by Jesus and, to some extent, by Jeremiah also. Cubberly, in summing up the contribution of Christianity to the ancient world, says "To the great contributions of Greece and Rome, there is now added, and added at a most opportune time, the contribution of Christianity. In taking the Jewish idea of one God, ^{and} freeing it from the narrow tribal limitations to which it had before been subject, Christ-

1 Hobhouse, L.T., "Morale in Evolution", p. 389

ianity made possible its general acceptance, first in the Roman world, and later in the Mohammedan world. With this was introduced the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and his love for man, the equality before God of all men and of the two sexes, the sacredness of each individual in the eyes of the Father. An entirely new conception of the individual was proclaimed to the world, and an entirely new ethical code was promulgated.----These ideas imparted to ancient society a new hopefulness and a new energy which were not only of great importance in dealing with the downfall of civilization and the deluge of barbarism which were impending, but which have been of prime importance during all succeeding centuries. (1)

We are not to forget that this tremendous lift to a dying and undone world came largely through the medium of the stories of Jesus. Says Dr. Curry, "The story is the simplest and most necessary means by which one can influence another.----The power to state events truthfully, without moralizing or theorizing, is found only in the supreme masters". (2) Again, Dr. Curry in speaking of the parable of the prodigal son, declares that "this story may be regarded as the noblest work of art in the world. It reveals the sublimest truths in the simplest way. It suggests the infinite love of the Eternal Father and His attitude toward the two kinds of perversion among His children, and appeals to the soul."

Of course we realize the parable of the prodigal son as

1 Cubberley, Ellwood P., "The History of Education" p.91f

2 Curry, S.S. "Vocal and Literary Interpretation of the Bible" p. 59.

only one from a vast range of parables which made up much of the warp and woof of the sayings of Jesus. The sower (1) the mustard-seed, (2) the wicked vine-dresser, (3) the leaven, (4) the lost sheep, (5) the tares, (6) the hidden treasure, (7) the pearl of great price, (8) the unforgiving servant, (9) the laborer in the vineyard, (10) are among the many which may be cited. Jesus was a master of the short, pithy story and, to this day, some of those he uttered, we are told, cannot be improved upon as a vehicles of spiritual teaching. The power of such story mastery in securing and holding attention is a commonplace of our own day as it was of His.

Some of these parables of Jesus can hardly even be called stories, though in story form. They might more properly be considered as brief, crisp bits of analogy. The pearl of great price and the leaven would come, perhaps, under this head.

That Jeremiah, to some degree at least, had the imagination and ability of the story teller is evinced by the way he depicts the pathetic fate of the rebellious king whom he must needs call Coniah. (11) He is to be a lifelong prisoner in Babylon and to leave no heir to the throne of David; being thus virtually childless.

The pictorial element in all of Jesus' teaching has, in the previous chapter been dealt with at length. It is well for us to remind ourselves here that, while Jeremiah cannot be given

- 1 Mt. 13:3-23 Mk. 4:3-20 Lu. 8:4-15.
- 2 Mt. 13:31-32 Mk. 4:30-32 Lu. 13:18, 19
- 3 Mt. 21:33-41 Mk. 12:1-9 Lu. 20:9-16
- 4 Mt. 13:33 (5) Mt. 18:13-14 (6) Mt. 12:24-30
- 7 Mt. 13:44 (8) Mt. 13:45, 46 (9) Mt. 18:23-25
- 10 Mt. 20:1-16 (11) Jer. 22:20-30

anything like equal footing with Jesus as a story teller, nevertheless, he frequently evinces the spirit and temper of the story teller in the pictorial and spectacular way in which he gets his message before the people. His prophecy concerning Baylon, for instance, is to be taken to Babylon as a testimony against them. It is then to be tied to a stone and sunken into the river Euphrates, as emblematic of the complete sinking of the proud and haughty city. Whether this was actually done or whether the whole situation is only an evidence of the pictorial nature of the man, we shall never actually know. (1)

Another striking illustration of this strongly pictorial and spectacular element which Jeremiah must have likewise used forceably in arresting public attention came in the situation of the girdle. Here Jehovah commands the prophet to wear a girdle around his loins certain days. He is then commanded to take it off and go to the Euphrates and there hide it in a hole in a rock. He lets it remain there for a considerable length of time. He is then commanded to go and get it. When he goes for it he finds that it has rotted away and is henceforth good for nothing. Now follows his lesson. "This evil people which refuse to hear my words, which walk in the imagination of their heart, and walk after other gods to serve them, and to worship them, shall even be as this girdle, which is good for nothing. For as the girdle cleaveth to the loins of a man, so have I caused to cleave unto me the whole house of Israel and the whole house of Judah---but they would not hear"(2) Of course, in a strict sense, there is

1 Jer. 50 and 51

2 Jer. 13:2-10

a difference between the use of physical symbols, as in the case of Jeremiah, and the use of the parable as a literary device, as in the case of Jesus. Our contention is that even though these sections of Jeremiah were literally acted out, practically they were symbolized or dramatized parables in the teaching of the people. If they were not acted out, as some scholars hold, especially in the one involving a trip to Babylon, we have in Jeremiah exactly the same literary device we find operative in the messages of Jesus, the only difference being that in Jeremiah the prophet uses the first person for the narratives while Jesus tells them in the third. The prominence of physical objects in this respect would constitute no difference, since Jesus too abounds in them as will be readily seen in consulting the footnotes of page 57.

Nor is this all. While both men by style of message, popular moment of message, and by general methods of the best narration and description sought to induce and hold the attention of the people, their very choice of the simplest words was significant. Hastings says of Jeremiah, "All his teachings, embodying as they did marvellous conceptions of the transcendent spirituality of God, were not couched in the language of abstract propositions, but were translated into the common speech of every day life and brought into closest correlation with contemporary politics". (1) No long and intricate verbiage is found on the lips of Jesus. The straightforward language of nature, of the home, and of the heart are his.

1 Hastings, James, "Greater Men and Women of the Bible". p. 262

Both men took their messages to the people rather than, like John the Baptist, going to some wilderness and there seeking to draw the people out to hear them. The foremost reason for this may have been that they considered this approach more efficacious. Another reason is that they personally loved the society of other people. Prof. Knudson says of Jeremiah, "He looked with pleasure upon the natural joys of life. The children in the street and the young men in the marketplace were to him special objects of sympathy and interest. (6:11 7:21). Time and again he speaks of the 'voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride'. (7:34 16:9 25:10 33:11). The incessant way in which he puts himself in the path of the people is trenchantly summed up by Eiselen in the following.

"The book of Jeremiah furnishes us with a good idea of the prophet's methods of work. He selects the most frequented places and most public occasions for the delivery of his discourses; the gates of the temple on a festival day, when people from all parts of Judah had come to worship; (7:2) the gates of the city through which both king and people must pass; (17:19) the court of the temple; (19:14, 26:2, 35:10) the royal palace; (22:1) the common dwelling of the Rechabites; (35:2) but he was not content with public discussion. He wished to impress his message more deeply by the performance of symbolic acts; for example, the hiding of the girdle by the Euphrates; (13:1ff) the breaking of the earthen vessel; (19:1ff) the purchase of the field in Anathoth; (32:6ff) the test of the Rechabites; (35:1ff) and the activity of the potter. (18:1ff) (1)

Though maintaining at all times the very closest relationship with life in all its phases, he nevertheless is forbidden to share in its joys as do other people. (15:17, 16:2) Consequently, he felt himself to be cut off from other people, condemned to isolation.

1 Eiselen, Frederick Carl, "The Prophets Books of the O.T." p.308

But his keen solicitations in behalf of his message were not even limited by the resourcefulness of his style and the incessancy of his contacts. He had his Baruch who wrote for him that succeeding ages might read. While "Jeremiah appears to have preached twenty years before he dictated a line to his scribe Baruch, and then only because he could not publicly speak in the temple, (XXXVI 1-5) the time did come when he began to feel the need of permanent record and in the person of Baruch he found one entirely consonant with his purpose and faithful to the work. (1)

We have evidence that on one occasion the prophecies were reduced to writing that the king might read. The prophet, forced into silence of lips, was still resolved that his testimony should go on. As the king heard the rolls read, we are told that he took his pen knife and cut them in pieces, three and four columns at a time, and threw them all into the fire, after which he ordered the arrest of Jeremiah and Baruch. "But Jehovah hid them". (36:26) We see from the foregoing that the faithful Baruch shared fully the pain and the danger involved in the procedure. While, as we have noted in an earlier chapter, there were several who at one time or another showed friendship toward the prophet, there was only one who might be named as his disciple.

With Jesus the case was somewhat different. His disciples numbered twelve and they all went with him around the country and shared fully in his work as far as their limited minds would allow. (2)

1 Kent, Chas. Foster, "The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament", p. 114

2 Matt. 10:1, 11:1.

CHAPTER SIX - THE TWO MEN FROM THE POINT OF PERSONAL RELIGION.

In approaching the personal religion of the prophets, we should first seek to ascertain their attitudes toward religion. In both cases religion was inward. It was a vital sense of communion and experience with God. Dr. H. P. Smith says that the most impressive thing about Jeremiah is that he led the life of prayer. On this account he feels that Jeremiah has reasonably been called the discoverer of individualism in religion. (1) This life of prayer we are given to understand was freely used in intercession for guilty Israel. Indeed, he even reaches the point where Yahweh stops him with the stern command not to intercede further. He tells him that even if Moses and Samuel, the two most powerful intercessors of past times, were to appear themselves in behalf of Israel their intercession would now be valueless. (2)

We find that Jesus' attitude toward religion also rested upon the idea of personal experience and communion with God in the heart of the individual. In his famous discourse on worship delivered to the Samaritan woman at the well we hear him say "Woman, the hour cometh and now is when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall men worship the Father, for God is a Spirit and He seeketh such to worship him who worship in Spirit and in truth". (3)

1 Smith, Henry Preserved, "The History of Israel", p. 167

2 Jer. 15:1

3 John 4:23.

We shall never fully realize the force of the positions taken with reference to such matters as temple, law, etc. except as we view them in the light of the principle of inner religion so steadfastly held by both in terms of living communion with God. What Bundy has said of Jesus in this connection will hold equally as well for Jeremiah. "Jesus' personal piety is primitive in that it lays hold of the elemental forces of the human constitution and puts at the center of life what it holds dear".

(1) Bundy continues to tell us how great an effect is produced by this absolute seizure of the whole personality by the one thing that is dearer than life itself, immediate communion with God and personal congruity with His holy will.

In Jer. 7:4-11 we find the prophet detaining the people even as they enter the temple to tell them that their surface trust in the protection of the temple is not enough. He follows with a wooing entreaty that they "mend their ways". "This was answer enough to those who were under the delusion that, because Jehovah had taken up his residence in the temple he was therefore obliged to protect it no matter what his worshippers might be doing". (2) When we consider how such language must have cut across the grain of these unthinking temple worshippers, we are not surprised to find that a mob gathers around him led by the priests and the prophets themselves. (3)

All of this easily recalls for us those momentous days

1 Bundy, "Our Recovery of Jesus" p. 149 f.

2 Smith, H. P. "The History of Israel". p. 173

3 Jer. 7:1-15 26:1-24

when Jesus of Nazareth was being grilled by his detractors because he allowed his disciples to eat grains of corn on the Sabbath. We remember that he pointed to the priests of the temple, who just because they are servants of the temple, feel that it is perfectly safe for them to profane the Sabbath, and concludes by telling them that "in this place is one greater than the temple". (1)

Again, as Jesus' heart sank within him at the hopeless condition of men who were altogether supplanting outer things for the inner reality of religion, his disciples themselves begin to show overweening estimation of these things by fondly pointing out to him some of the choicest stones of the structure. Then it was that Jesus replied, "See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down". (2) Indeed, so urgent and so insistent was Jesus' declaration that the temple alone could not save the people and so highly incensed were the people by his remarks that even as he hung dying upon Calvary's Cross, one of the railings hurled at him was, "Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it again in three days, save thyself". (3) Little matter was it to them that he spake of the temple of his own body. The use of the very word was sacred to them, so sacred that no one should dare intimate that its protection was not entirely safe and final.

When we come to note the effect of this principle of inner

1 Matt. 12:5-6

2 Matt. 24:1-2

3 Matt. 27:40

religion upon the prophets' utterances concerning the law, we find in Jeremiah's case a variation of opinion. Dr. G. G. Findlay, in his "Jeremiah" article, written for Hasting's Bible Dictionary, calls the problem of Jeremiah's attitude toward the Deuteronomic reforms the greatest enigma of Jeremiah's history. (1) The question is indeed perplexing, due mainly to the divergent nature of the materials to be found in the book of Jeremiah itself, which is, after all, our ~~main~~ evidence in the case.

By way of clarification, let us enumerate the various evidences as they actually appear. First, in the year 621 B. C. the Book of Law was found in the temple by Hilkiah. It would be aside from our point to discuss whether the finding was accidental or staged. Sufficeth to say that considerable evidence seems to point to the idea that this Book of the Law had been prepared by the Prophetic Party in Jerusalem under cover during the terrible reign of Manasseh in hopeful anticipation of the day when it might be used to project their reforms. Josiah was their king, hidden away in his infancy and carefully schooled in their position. He was now old enough to act in his own right. In fact the time was ripe for such a find.

Immediately, the prophetess Huldah was consulted regarding it's authenticity, validity, etc. She gives a positive pronouncement and the rolls are then read to the king. Scholars have suspicioned that Jeremiah was ignored in this initial consultation because of certain prophecies which he had, shortly before, made against Judah at the hands of the Scythians, which prophecies were

1 Findlay, G. G. "Hastings Bible Dict", art. on "Jeremiah", p. 434

religion upon the progress of civilization concerning the law, we find in Jeremiah's case a variation of opinion. Dr. G. O. Wainwright, in his "Jerusalem," article, written for Hastings' Bible Dictionary, calls the people of Jerusalem's attitude toward the Deity, "the reform of the greatest origin of Jerusalem's history." (1) The question is indeed perplexing, but mainly to the divergent nature of the materials to be found in the book of Jeremiah itself, which is, after all, our main evidence in the case.

By way of clarification, let us summarize the various evidence as they actually appear. First, in the year 601 B. C. the Book of Law was found in the temple by Shilshu. It would be quite from our point to discuss whether the finding was accidental or staged. Suffice it to say that considerable evidence seems to indicate that this Book of the Law had been prepared by the Prophecy Party in Jerusalem under cover during the reign of Manasseh in hopeful anticipation of the day when it might be used to protect their reform. Josiah was their king, although in his infancy and carefully schooled in their position. He was not old enough to act in his own right. In fact the time was ripe for such a find.

Immediately, the prophecies which were connected with the find's authenticity, validity, etc. are given a positive pronouncement and the rolls are then read to the king. Scholars have mentioned that Jeremiah was ignored in this initial conversation because of certain prophecies which he had, mostly before, made against Judah at the hands of the Babylonians, which prophecies were

very definitely unfulfilled during the Scythian invasion. Prof. Knudson looks askance at these suspicions, suggesting that the prophet was still very young, that he had been prophecying only a few years, and that most probably he was simply not very well known at court^s. Again, he suggests, the young prophet may have very well been absent from the city at this particular time. (1) At any rate, we have no indication whatever from Jeremiah himself that he even noticed the supposed slight. Certainly, knowing as much as we do about the spirit of the man, it would be monstrous to assume that any such circumstance would have had the slightest bearing upon his attitude toward the Deuteronomic Laws.

The third piece of exact evidence gives us to understand that the Book of the Law^s recently found was read three times in a single day. This consideration alone forever excludes the idea that the Book of the Law was simply the Pentateuch. The lengths of the various books thereof render it highly improbably that it was any entire book. The core of the Book of Deuteronomy exactly corresponds to the reforms of Josiah. It is small enough as to have been so handled. It is an enlargement of the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20 through 23). It implies further development and more advanced social conditions. It's views of the monarchy reflect the painful national experiences. The forms of idolatry opposed are those evident in the Assyrian period. It shows a certain literary influence absent before the reign of Manasseh in all prophetic writing. It's developed style reveals a considerable period of literary productivity preceding. It

1. Knudson, Albert C., "Beacon Lights of Prophecy" p. 175 f.

It condemns certain religious practices which were permissible under the earlier covenant. It evinces advanced theological reflection. Hence, we conclude that this Book read three times in a day for Josiah and the people was none other than the Book of Deuteronomy. (1)

The fourth line of evidence comes from the Book of Jeremiah itself. In Jeremiah 11:1-17 we hear the prophet telling the people of Judah that they are to "hear the words of this covenant", and that the man who will not hear will be accursed. Dr. George Adam Smith pungently asks, "In the reign of Josiah what could 'this covenant' mean but the recently discovered Book of the Law? That its essence was spiritual and ethical is expressed in the Deuteronomic phrases which follow. Therefore, we may believe that Jeremiah heard in the heart of Deuteronomy the call of God, that he uttered his Amen to it; and that, from his experience of the evils of the high places, he felt obliged, as he records, to proclaim 'this covenant' throughout Judah. Further substantiation of the idea of 'this covenant' as the Law which had been found lies in the fact that in this same chapter the prophet tells of conspiracy against his life by the men of Anathoth, evidently resulting from the attitude of his which would abolish rural sanctuaries.

Our fifth line of evidence lies in Jeremiah 7:1-17. Nothing here contradicts Deuteronomy. The sacredness with which the Book has invested the One Sanctuary is acknowledged. But the people have no moral sense of that sacredness. Their confidence in the

1 Ryle, Herbert Edward, "The Canon of the Old Testament", p. 48 ff.

Temple is material and superstitious, fostered as we may believe, by the peace they were enjoying and their relief from a foreign sovereignty, as well as by their formal observances. What has been found to rally and guide spiritual faith they turn into a fetish and even into an indulgence for their wickedness. Formality and vice have conspired with each other. As God's tester of the people, he has been watching their response to the revelation accepted. It has proved that their obedience was by letter rather than by spirit. They superstitiously revered institutions while they ignored ethics. The temple could not hope to stand under such circumstances and the law was powerless to save them.

In our sixth evidence, Jeremiah 8:8, the prophet speaks of the "falsing pen of the scribes which hath wrought falsehood". He then chides them with the question "How say you then 'We are wise; the law of the Lord is with us' knowing these things?" Some, as Dr. George Adam Smith pithily points out, take this as a proof that Jeremiah was against Deuteronomy. (1) Others say that this falsification does not refer to 'this covenant' but to that of Sinai. Others, as Dr. Knudson shows, contend that Jeremiah may have been referring to neither covenant as such, but to certain interpolations which were added. (2)

Coupled with these six varieties of evidence, we have the fact that Jeremiah had nothing but praise for King Josiah. Now considering the fact that the Deuteronomic reforms were the chief events by all odds in the short reign, it is almost unthinkable that Jeremiah could have sharply reacted against them and yet

1 Smith, George Adam, "Jeremiah", p. 155.

2 Knudson, Albert C., "The Beacon Lights of Proph.", p. 177

maintained the highest regard for Josiah as king.

Let us turn from the actual points of evidence to the general temper of the Book of Deuteronomy and then compare this with the known temper of the prophet's ministry. The Book of Deuteronomy is wonderfully lenient with the poor and afflicted classes, providing even that a man's cloak should not be kept over night as surety for a debt. It is ethical and presents justice and fairness among men. yet, it's ~~ethical~~ and humanitarian attitudes are all couched in strictly legal terms. It is strictly law, with no elasticity provided for any kind of attinuating circumstances beyond the written word. It provides for ornate temple ritual and centralization of worship in the temple at Jerusalem. It is, at the same time striatly for the guidance of the Hebrew people. We search in vain here for any kind of real vision relating to the universality of Hebrew religion. As Dr. Smith puts it, "Deuteronomy has three cardinal doctrines. They are, One God, One Temple, and One People". (1)

Under the concept of one God there is ample treatment of monotheism with it's appropriate warnings, together with an ~~ethical~~ picture of God in His righteousness, power, and grace. Under the concept of One Altar, we have the feeling of the prophet for purity of worship and unity as over against the divergent forms and practices and licenses which grew out of small sanctuaries here and there, which were not always properly supervised. Under the concept of One People, Judah is brought to a full consciousness of her religions selfhood. As Dr. A. B. Davidson points

1 Smith, George Adam, "Jeremiah", p. 136 ff.

out, this latter concept became more of a curse than a blessing, Says he "Phariseeism and Deuteronomy came into the world on the same day".

Now what was the temper of Jeremiah's ministry? It certainly cannot be denied that he too was strongly ethical and humane. We would not imagine Jeremiah as opposing legislation which lifted the position of woman, the poor, the stranger, the debtor, the needy priest, and provided proper means for the education of children. Equally well may we be assured that he was in hearty agreement with the law which forbids the base thought as well as the base deed.

But with the increasing years of Jeremiah, he came more and more to emphasize the personal side of religion. He began to see that legislation, however good, did not go deeply enough to meet the need. The Law must be written upon the tablets of the heart. A New Covenant of Spirit whereby personal attitudes cause righteousness to be a matter of impulsion rather than compulsion must come to the people. They must be bathed with a living sense of personal responsibility to God. The Law can never hope to cover every possible human situation. It has no elasticity for special circumstances. Furthermore, one may technically keep it with a heart that is far from the true spirit of it. It is in this connection that in Jer. 7:21-23 we hear the prophet cry "Thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel; Add ye burnt offerings unto sacrifices and eat ye the flesh. For I spake unto your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices".

Indeed, Dr. Smith carries the matter much further and declares that the prophet probably meant to be taken literally. While it may well be taken as a reproof for the religion which rests in such things, the whole weight of historical evidence would support the prophet in a literal contention at this point. Animal sacrifice is probably a survival of Semitic religion brought down from their forebears. (1)

Again, Jeremiah's religion is pervasive. He is non-ritualistic. While we have no direct evidence that he abhorred ritual as such, it is very certain that he made no place for it in his thinking. This attitude, of course, would present a bold contrast to the temper of Deuteronomy.

Is it any wonder, then, as we think upon the points of splendid agreement, of the points of sharp contrast, and of the points of comparison that are left unanswered by the evidence, that we should find many attitudes prevailing today among scholars regarding the position of Jeremiah with reference to the Deuteronomic Law? One position, built upon certain fragments of the total evidence, avers that he was uncompromisingly opposed to them and to all legislation as a means of righteousness. An opposite extreme voices itself in the conclusion that he was always its ardent advocate. A third position, that taken by Prof. Knudson, is that he was mildly and passively in favor of it but desired to go much deeper. (2) A fourth position, maintained by Dr. George Adam Smith and by Prof. Clelland is voiced in the idea that as a young prophet he was enthusiastically for the reforms, but, as time went on and as he, the "Tester of the

1 Smith, George Adam, "Jeremiah" p. 158 ff.

2 Knudson, Albert C., "Beacon Lights of Prophecy" p. 177 ff.

people", observed their practical results, he was driven further and further in principle from the genius of Deuteronomic legislation as an adequate ethical means of dealing with the religious problems of his people. (1)

The New Covenant, as has been pointed out, was for Jeremiah the only ultimate hope for a people who were lost in a dark night of legalism. Jesus, according to the records, considered himself to be the fulfilment of this prophetic desire. He too had to face a gainsaying people who believed that the outer law and routine conformity was all that God expected or could look for. He too sought to help them to see that nothing is good that does not proceed from personal motive and righteousness of purpose. As in the case of Jeremiah, we have evidence that Jesus was not unqualifiedly against the law as such. It was the abuse of the law that he condemned. Indeed, his function was thought of as a grand fulfilment, not an abrogation. But it was the fulfilment which Jeremiah saw as alone complete and final--a heart of flesh for a heart of stone and the law of God in the inward parts. (2)

1 Smith, George Adam, "Jeremiah" p 142 f
2 Jer. XXIV, 7

CHAPTER SEVEN. - POSSIBLE INFLUENCES OF JEREMIAH ON JESUS.

As a final chapter, let us suggest the possible influence of Jeremiah on Jesus. Of course, we do not mean by the term 'influence' the kind of thing we might mean as between two modern writers. We believe that the life of Jesus was unified; that it grew to its fulness in an organic way and, like any living organism, it appropriated whatever it found of living value to its own growth and fulfillment.

We admit at the outset that the influence of Jeremiah upon Jesus is subtle, illusive, and all but impossible of exact definition. The materials are by no means as plentiful as they would have been in a comparison of Isaiah and Jesus, especially Deutero-Isaiah.

There are, however, some clear-cut indications of influence. There is the statement of his disciples in answer to his question, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" "Some say John the Baptist; some Elijah; and others Jeremiah". (Matt. 16:13-14) Then there is his definite quotation from Jeremiah in the cleansing of the Temple: "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations, but ye have made it a den of robbers". (Mark 11:17 - Jer. 7:11) Evidently there were some, perhaps many, who saw a striking similarity in the spirit and work of Jesus to that of Jeremiah. Surely, the evils of the temple regime and of the priesthood affected him with an intensity that engendered in him a spirit of denunciation and protest akin to that of Jeremiah's against the priestly corruptions of his day.

Aside from these two instances, we may trace a more inward and significant influence.

First, growing up as he did, in a devout home, living as he did in the open atmosphere of Galilee, rather than the constricted life of Jerusalem, free as he was in his access to the synagogues and the scrolls and scriptures read and taught there, it would have been strange indeed if the inner intensities of Jeremiah's writings had not touched his own sensitive nature and aided him in his growth in personal intimacy with God. It is the inner life of Jesus in its growing oneness with the Father that resembles and transcends that of Jeremiah.

Second, the incident of the transfiguration is again exceedingly suggestive. The moment is tense. The Galilean leaders had turned against him, the Scribes and Pharisees were now openly avowed against him in Jerusalem; had he not charged them, among other things, with keeping the traditions of men while violating the true laws of God? (Matt. 23:13-33) Multitudes affected by the criticisms and denunciations of the scribes and the Pharisees were leaving him, seemingly in disappointment. The leaven of the Pharisees had entered the minds even of the Twelve. (Matt. 16:6) To battle with this situation he had left Galilee and was traveling with his disciples in outlying territories. It was near Caesarea Phillippi that he put the faith of his disciples to the test and received Peter's great confession, yet, as soon as he made known to them the fact that arrest and death lay ahead, they were dismayed. (Matt. 16:13-28) All this and more led to the transfiguration experience. (Matt. 17:1-8) Of what transpired

Aside from these two instances, he may trace a more intimate

and significant influence.

First, growing up as he did, in a devout home, living as

he did in the open atmosphere of Galilee, rather than the con-

stricted life of Jerusalem, free as he was in his access to the

synagogue and the attic and scribbles red and white there,

it would have been strange indeed if the inner intention of

Jerusalem's writings had not found their own negative answer

and aimed him in the growth in personal intimacy with God. It

is the inner life of Jesus in the growing oneness with the Father

that explains and transcends that of Jerusalem.

Second, the incident of the transfiguration is again ex-

ceedingly suggestive. The moment is Jesus. The Galilean leaders

had turned against him, the Pharisees and Sadducees were now openly

avowed against him in Jerusalem; and he had been charged with many

other things, with keeping the traditions of men while violating

the true laws of God (Matt. 23:18-35). Nevertheless affected by

the criticism and denunciations of the scribes and the Pharisees

was leaving him, seemingly in disappointment. The leaders of the

Pharisees had entered the minds even of the Twelve (Matt. 12:15).

To battle with this situation he had left Galilee and was travel-

ing with the disciples in country territories. It was near

Caesarea Philippi that he put the faith of the disciples to the

test and received Peter's great confession, yet, as soon as he

made known to them the fact that Christ and death lay ahead, they

were dismayed (Matt. 16:13-28). All this and more led to the

transfiguration experience (Matt. 17:1-8). Of what significance

on the mount itself we know very little. Jesus was in intense prayer, the disciples slept and awoke to find him radiant and victorious. It is the result of this transfiguration experience that gives us our clue to the meaning. Facing increasing discord, animosity, trial and inevitable death, whence came the power to enable him to accept such an eventuation to his career, not merely in the spirit of stoic endurance but of glad acceptance as if indeed it were the will of God. Did he not once say "So persecuted they the prophets that were before me". (Matt. 5:12) Did he not seek to convince his disciples that his trial and death would be but the fulfilment of the prophetic utterances of the coming Messiah? (Mark 9:13) Where in the prophets do we find the inspiration to endure vicarious suffering better than in Deutero-Isaiah (Isaiah 53)? And who among the prophets of the past better exemplified this spirit of prophecy than Jeremiah whose heroic life of suffering, many scholars think, was the inspiration of Isaiah's lofty philosophy of suffering? (1) To say the least, the idea is entirely plausible that this spirit of Jeremiah entered into the spirit of Jesus to nerve him for his final adventure in redemptive suffering.

Thirdly, at the Last Supper, that supreme hour of fellowship with his own immediate followers, Jesus reveals his mission in life. He took a piece of bread and asked God to bless it, broke it into pieces and passed it around, saying "Take ye; this is my body". (Mark 14:22) After these words, he took a cup of wine, and after prayer, he gave it to them to drink, saying,

1 Smith, G. A. Jeremiah p. 349

on the mount itself we know very little. Jesus was in distress
 prayer, and disciples slept and were to find him faint and
 victorious. It is the result of a long and arduous experience
 that gives us our clue to the meaning. Facing impending death,
 unshakably, firm and inviolable death, whence came the power to
 enable him to accept such an eventuality to his career, not
 merely in the spirit of stoic endurance but of glad acceptance
 as it turned out was the will of God. Did he not once say "No
 persecuted they the prophets that were before me." (Matt. 23:35)
 Did he not seek to sacrifice his disciples that his trial and death
 would be but the fulfillment of the prophetic utterances of the
 coming Messiah? (Mark 8:31) Where in the prophets do we find
 the invitation to endure victorious suffering better than in
 Isaiah 53? And who among the prophets of the
 great better exemplified this spirit of prophecy than Isaiah
 whose heroic life of suffering, many scholars think, was the
 inspiration of Isaiah's lofty philosophy of suffering. (1)
 To say the least, the idea is entirely plausible that this
 spirit of Isaiah entered into the spirit of Jesus to move him
 for his final adventure in redemptive suffering.

Thirdly, at the last supper, that evening hour of Jesus
 with his own immediate followers, Jesus reveals his mission
 in life. He took a glass of bread and asked God to bless it,
 broke it into pieces and passed it around, saying "Take ye; this
 is my body." (Mark 14:22) After these words, he took a cup of
 wine, and after prayer, he gave it to them to drink, saying,

"This is my blood of the Covenant, which is poured out for many".

(Mark 13:24) This to the disciples was the New Covenant which was made by the Messiah. The Old Covenant written on tables of stone, was the ^{one} made by Jehovah and his people at Mount Sinai.

(Exodus 24:1-8) Here in his last day of fellowship with his Chosen, Jesus speaks of his death as the bond which binds men and God together, not in terms of ritual or external evidences alone but by loyal, whole-hearted obedience to God and his Messiah, which comes only from a heart given solely to God's guidance and power. Jesus' death on the cross was to be a significant death, a meaningful one, a proof of God's guidance, of His redeeming love for all mankind, a purposeful experience which revealed the union of God and man, whose self-hood and self-giving was thereby made manifest. Surely, if his disciples knew their Scriptures at all, on that night they were reminded of the prophet's famous prediction of the New Covenant: " I will make a New Covenant with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their Fathers in the days that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt: which covenant they brake.--But this is the covenant that I shall make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts and in their hearts will I write it; and I will be their God and they shall be my people; and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor and every man his brother saying, Know Jehovah, for they shall all know me, from the least of them saith Jehovah; for I will forgive their iniquity and remember their sins no more." (Jeremiah 31:31-34.)

The dream of Jeremiah has reached its glad fruition. A New Covenant of love and trust and obedience to God, written not artificially or miraculously on the hearts of a select few, but to be won eventually through the grace of the knowledge of his redemptive life, and of the eternal wonder of his sacrificial death; a covenant of loyalty and love that is freely given and freely received by all those who would become, by faith, children of the living God.

Aside from all this, it seems that we would be justified in saying that the similarities between the life of Jeremiah and the life of Jesus, quite apart from exact evidences, are in many cases so striking as to argue strongly for the influence of Jeremiah upon Jesus. Prof. W. Robertson Nicoll thinks ~~also~~, and with his words we close.

"Jeremiah and our Lord appeared at similar crises in the history of Israel and of revealed religion. The prophet foretold the end of the Jewish monarchy, the destruction of the first Temple and of ancient Jerusalem; Christ in like manner prophesied the end of the restored Jerusalem, the destruction of the second Temple and of the newer Jerusalem. In both cases the doom of the city was followed by the dispersion and the captivity of the people. At both eras the religion of the people was supposed to be indissolubly bound up with the Temple and its ritual; and, as we have seen, Jeremiah, like Stephen and Paul and our Lord himself; was charged with blasphemy because he predicted its coming ruin. The prophet, like Christ, was at variance with the

prevalent religious sentiment of his time and with what claimed to be orthodox. Both were regarded and treated by the great body of religious teachers and leaders as dangerous and intolerable heretics; and their heresy, as we have said, was practically one and the same.

To the champions of the temple, their teachings seemed purely destructive, an irrelevant attack upon fundamental doctrines and indispensable institutions. But the very opposite was the truth. They destroyed nothing but what deserved to perish. Both in Jeremiah's time and in our Lord's, men tried to assure themselves of the permanence of erroneous dogmas and obsolete rites by proclaiming that these were of the essence of divine revelation. In either age to have succeeded in this effort would have been to plunge the world into spiritual darkness; the light of Hebrew prophecy would have been extinguished by the captivity, or, again, the hope of a Messiah would have melted away like a mirage when the legions of Titus or of Hadrian dispelled so many Jewish dreams. But before the catastrophe came Christ in Jerusalem had taught men that Jehovah's temple and city were destroyed by his own set purpose because of the sins of the people; there was no excuse for supposing that He was discredited by the ruin of the place where He had come and once chosen to set His name.

Thus, the Captivity was not the final page in the history of the Hebrew people but the opening of a new chapter. In like manner also Christ and His Apostles, more especially Paul, finally dissociated Revelation from the Temple and its ritual so that the light of Divine truth was not hidden under the bushel

of Judaism, but shone forth upon the whole world from the many branched candlestick of the Universal Church.

Again, in both cases, not only was ancient faith rescued from the ruin of human corruption and commentary but the purging away of the old leaven made room for a positive statement of new teaching. Jeremiah announced a New Covenant----that is, a formal and complete change in the conditions and methods of man's service to God and God's benefits to men. The ancient church with its sanctuary, its clergy, and its ritual was to be superceded by a new order, without sanctuary, clergy, or ritual, wherein every man would enjoy immediate fellowship with his God.

The great ideal was virtually ignored by the Jews of the Restoration, but it was set forth afresh by Christ and His Apostles. The New Covenant was declared to be ratified by His sacrifice, and was confirmed anew at every commemoration of His death. We read in John 4:21-24 "The hour cometh when neither in this mountain nor at Jerusalem shall men worship the Father. God is a spirit and He seeketh such to worship Him who worship in Spirit and in Truth".

Thus, when we confess that the church is built upon the foundation of the prophets and the apostles, we have to recognize that to this foundation Jeremiah's ministry supplied indispensable elements. This fact was manifest even to Renan, who fully shared the popular prejudices against Jeremiah. Yet he says that 'nothing short of Christianity is the realization of the prophet's dream". (1)

1 Nicoll, W. Robertson, "The Expositor's Bible"--"Jeremiah" p. 370f.

Bibliography

- Bailey, Albert Edward
and
Kent, Charles Foster History of the Hebrew Commonwealth
New York: Scribner's, 1920
- Barton, George A. Religion of Israel
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918
- Bundy, Walter E. Our Recovery of Jesus
Indianapolis: The Bobbs Merrill Co.
1929.
- Bratton, Fred G. Legalism and Prophetism. Meth. Rev. Sep. Oct. '28
- Case, Shirley Jackson Jesus - A New Biography.
Chicago: The U of Chic., 1929
- Class lectures and Notes
- Cornill, Carl Heinrich The Prophets of Israel. 10th edition
Chicago: The Open Court Pub. Co., 1913
- Cubberley, Ellwood P. The History of Education.
Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920.
- Curry, S. S. Vocal and Literary Interpretations of
the Bible N. Y., Macmillan, 1920.
- Davidson, A. B. Old Testament Prophecy.
Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912.
- Dargan, E. C. The Changeless Christ.
Nashville; Sou. Bapt. S. S. Board, 1915.
- Eiselen, Frederick Carl The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament
New York: The Methodist Book Concern,
1923
- Prophecy and the Prophets.
New York: The Methodist Book Concern,
1920.
- Foalkes-Jackson, F. J. The Biblical History of the Hebrews.
Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1917.
- Garvie, Alfred Ernest The Christian Preacher.
New York: Scribner's, 1921.
- Gospels Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.
The New Testament.

Bibliography Continued.

- Hobhouse, L. T. Morals in Evolution.
New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1916.
- Hastings, James The Greater Men & Women of the Bible. New York: Scribner's 1915.
- Jeremiah The Book of Jeremiah
Old Testament.
- Josephus, Flavius The Works of Flavius Josephus.
Phil: The John C. Winston Co.
- Kent, Charles Foster Life and Teachings of Jesus.
New York: Scribner's, 1916.
- Biblical Geography and History.
New York: Scribner's, 1914.
- Knudson, Albert C. The Beacon Lights of Prophecy.
New York: The Methodist Book
Concern, 1914.
- Lindsay, Thomas M. A History of the Reformation. Vol. 1.
New York: Scribner's, 1916.
- Mackintosh, H. R. The Doctrine of the Person of
Jesus Christ. New York: Scribner's
1920.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson The Expositor's Bible - Jeremiah
Pt. 11, New York: A. C. Armstrong
and Son, 1915.
- Paterson, W. P. Jesus Christ, Article on.
Hasting's Bible Dictionary.
N. Y., Scribner's, 1918.
- Peake, A. S. The New Century Bible - Jeremiah.
Vol. 1. N. Y. Henry Frowde, 1920.
- Philosophy, The Journal of Series XXI, Vol. 19, p. 528.
- Quayle, William A. Out of Doors with Jesus.
New York: Abingdon Press, 1924.
- Smith, George Adam Jeremiah
- Smith, Henry Preserved The Religion of Israel.
N. Y., Scribner's 1928.

Bibliography Continued

Smith, W. Robertson

The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. London: Adams & Charles Black, 1908.

Smith, J. M. P.

The Prophet and His Problems. Chicago: The Univ. of Chic. Press, 1914.

Wendt, Hans Heinrich

The Prophets and Their Times. Chicago: The Univ. of Chic. Press, 1925.

Wendt, Hans Heinrich

The Teachings of Jesus. New York: Scribner's 1892.

Warschauer

The Historical Life of Christ. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918.

Bibliography Continued.

Some additional sources used in general preparation

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| Fowler, Henry Thatcher | <u>A History of the Literature of
Ancient Israel.</u>
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912. |
| Kent, Charles Foster | <u>The Origin and Permanent Value
Of The Old Testament.</u>
New York: Scribner's, 1914. |
| Kent, Charles Foster | <u>Biblical Geography and History.</u>
New York: Scribner's 1914. |
| Peake, Arthur S. | <u>Brotherhood in the Old Testament.</u>
New York: Doran, 1923. |
| Robinson, H. Wheeler | <u>The Religious Ideas of the Old
Testament.</u>
New York: Scribner's 1915. |
| Schweitzer, Albert | <u>The Quest of the Historical Jesus.</u>
<u>A Critical Study of Its Progress</u>
<u>from Reimarus to Wrede.</u>
London: A & C Black, 1926. |



BOSTON UNIVERSITY

1 1719 02572 8793

